4 DECEMBER 1947

INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
OIKAWA, Koshiro (recalled)	34569
Direct by Mr. Brannon	34569
Cross by Lr. Keenan	34575
AFTERNOON RECESS	34584
Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Keenan Cross by Lr. Logan (cont'd)	34585 34600
(Witness excused)	34602

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

Doc.	bef.	Pros.	Description	For In Ident.Evider
2705	3541		Certificate of non- availability of telegram sent by Minister SHIGEMITSU to Foreign Minister YOSHIZAWA between April 1932 and May 1932 re Agreement f the Cessation of Hostilities around Shanghai	
2905	3542		Contemporary corrobor- ation by R. T. Peyt Griffin, Editor of "North China Daily News"	on-
2873	3543		Statement of Lord Killearn, Special Commissioner in Southeast Asia in Singapore, dated 27 February 1947	34494
2684	3544		Statement of Nelson Trusler Johnson, dated 19 August 194	17 34495
	3545	*	Book entitled "Sino- Foreign Treaty Series" (printed in Chinese)	34498
2706A	3545-	Λ	Certificate of non- availability of the original Chinese to of Annex I to the I tocol between Chine Russia re East of Hunchun Borderline	Pro+

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

Doc.	Def. Pros.	Description For Ident.	In vidence
No.	No. No.	Description	
2706В	3545-B	Certificate of authenticity re the Chinese text of the Protocol of Border Lines, Annex I	
		to the Hunchun Border Protocol being identical with the Chinese text contained in "Diplomatic	
		Documents during the Ching Dynasty" Volume 68	34505
2706		Annex I: The Protocol of	
(Revised)	3545-C	Border Lines of the First Section	34505
2079	3546	Affidavit of Joseph E. Davies	34507
2869	3547	Statement of Right Honorable Lord Hankey	34511
		MORNING RECESS	34514
1772A	3548	Record of Conversation between Lord Hankey and SHIGEMITSU	34522
1774	3549	Statement of Lord Sempil, Elected Scots Repre- sentative Peer	34523

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

(contid)

Doc.	Def.	Pros.	Description Ident.	In Evidence
2872	3550		Statement of R. A. Butler, former Member of the British Cabinet	34528
1777	3551		Affidavit of Joseph P. Kennedy	34530
1983	3552		Statement of Howell Arthur Gwynne	34535
	3 5 5 3		Book entitled "Secret Session Speeches Delivered by the Right Honorable Winston Churchill 34538	
2885	3554		Affidavit of TOYODA, Teijiro	34540
2887	3555		Cable interrogation of Sir Robert Craigie	34544
			NOON RECESS	34544
1811	3556		Official Dispatch dated 2 September 1944 from OKAMOTO, Japanese Minister to Sweden to SHIGEMITSU	34550
2051	3557		Minutes of the Proceed- ings of the Supreme War Directing Con- ference (15 September 1944)	34551

4 DECEMBER 1947

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

Loc.	Def. Pros.	Description Iden	In Evidenc
1778		ffidavit of Wider Bagge, dated 10 May 1947	34559
2894	3558-A	Certificate of non- availability of telegrams between OKAMOTO and Foreign Minister TOGO re soundings of Peace with the Allied Powers	34559
2890	3559	Affidavit of OIKAWA, Koshiro	34569
328	3 3560	Excerpts from the "Asahi Shimbun" 16 September 1941 issue	34595

Thursday, 4 December 1947

2 3

4

5

6

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan

8

9

The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, at 0930.

10

Appearances:

11 12

For the Tribunal, all Members sitting, with the exception of: HONORABLE JUSTICE SIR WILLIAM F. WEBB, Member from the Commonwealth of Australia, not sitting from 0930 to 1600.

14 15

16

13

For the Prosecution Section, same as before. For the Defense Section, same as before.

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

(English to Japanese and Japanese to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, IMTFE.)

Knapp & Kapleau

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far Fast is now in session.

ACTING PRESENT: All the accused are present except MATSUI, who is represented by counsel. We have a certificate from the prison surgeon at Sugamo certifying that he is ill and unable to attend the trial today. The certificate will be recorded and filed.

with the Tribunal's permission the accused SHIMADA and SHIRATORI will be absent from the courtroom the whole of the morning session conferring with their counsel.

Captain Kraft.

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Captain Kraft): If the Tribunal please, the following language corrections are submitted:

Reference exhibit 3516-A, line 10 from bottom of page 2 and record page 34,156, line 1: Delete "on the pretext of the Danzig problem" and substitute "by seizing the moment presented by the Fanzig problem."

Reference exhibit 43, first paragraph, line 6, and record page 34,190, line 18: Delete "its own race" and substitute "the peoples concerned."

Reference page 34,148, lines 7 to 10:
Delete "Powever, it may be possible that the official in charge of economic affairs in my embassy may have talked with Wiehl about something that I told this officer in charge" and substitute "Powever. it may be possible that I talked with Wiehl about something that the official in charge of economic affairs in my embassy may have told me."

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Furness.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, I shall now read exhibit 3540, admitted into evidence at the close of yesterday's session. I omit the formal parts.

"I, MORIYA, Kazuro, after having been duly sworn according to the Japanese formula, make the following statement of my own free will:

"I am 55 years of age and reside at No. 74. Nishi-gahara-machi, Kita Ward, Tokyo, Japan.

"1. I graduated from the Faculty of Law,
Tokyo Imperial University, in July, 1917, and
entered the Foreign Service at the end of 1923. I
remained in the service of that Ministry for seventeen years until I resigned as Minister accredited
to Afghanistan in December, 1940. During the period
from November, 1929, to 1932, I served about three

3 4

years as First Secretary of Legation under Mr. SHIGEMITSU, who was at first Consul General at Shanghai and concurrently Counsellor of Embassy, and later Minister accredited to China.

"2. At the beginning of September, 1931, when I was First Secretary of Legation under Minister SHIGHITSU he made a proposal to !'r. T. V. Soong, the Finance Minister of the Chinese Government, that the actual situation in Manchuria be investigated together, as Minister SHIGEMITSW was anxious about the situation then prevailing in that part of China. lest it should affect Sino-Japanese relations, and had at the same time a desire to open negotiations for revision of the Sino-Japanese Treaty of Commerce. Mr. Soong's consent having been obtained, Minister SHIGEMITSU planned to take a toat on September 8, 1931, from Shanghai to Dairen, Menchuria, taking with him Mr. HAYASHIDE, Secretary-Interpreter of Legation, and myself, who was then in charge of the question of treaty revision. We were making preparations for the trip in strict secrecy, having contact with Count Yasuya UCHIDA, Fresident of the South Manchuria Railway, who was in Tairen and who it was planned was to take part in the conferences. Unfortunately, however, l'inister SHIGFL'ITSU was suddenly

9

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

12

11

14 15

16

17

18

20

21 22

23

taken ill with a cold and had a high temperature due to tonsilitis and so could not travel. We were unable to start as scheduled, and were obliged to wait for the next boat, which would be available about ten days later. Information to this effect was given to Mr. T. V. Soong, who had planned to proceed by land to lukden via Peking. As Mr. SHIGEMITSU's health soon improved, a new plan was made to depart on September 20. Just at that time a telegram came, at noon on September 19, reporting the occurrence of an incident at Liu-teao-kou. His planned trip to Manchuria was thus frustrated. All this information came to me as part of my official duties in the Legation.

hai, where the main office of our Legation was located, the first Shanghai incident broke out. Clashes between Japanese marines and Chinese soldiers took place in the middle of that month, when I was Charge d' Affaires ad interim in the absence of Minister SHIGEMITSU in Japan. It was on the 30th or 31st of January that the Minister returned to his post by boat. I took a launch to meet him before he landed, and had an opportunity for communicating with him before he talked with any other person. He was ill-

humored that day, and repeatedly told me his dissatisfaction at the outbreak of the clashes between the troops, while he expressed his firm determination to settle the situation by peaceful means.

"4. Upon lending, Minister SHIGTTITSU began to make every effort to realize a truce as soon as possible. Even before formal conferences under the procedure proposed by the League of Nations started, he had many informal conferences with Sir l'iles Lampson, the British Minister, and Mr. Nelson Trusler Johnson, the American Minister. At his request they got in touch with the Chinese General in the height of the hostilities and a temporary truce was effected in order to allow Chinese non-combatants to evacuate Chapei, in which hostilities centered, thus saving the civilian population from the full effect of the fighting. During its course he persuaded the officers in command of the Japanese forces to limit the fighting to Shanghai and the adjacent area, and not to advance further into China. It was just at the time when the Agreement for the Cessation of Hostilities around Shanghai was almost concluded that Finister SHIGEMITSU had the misfortune to be wounded seriously by a bomb explosion. The bomb was thrown on April 29 during the celebration of the "mperor's birthday in New Park,

3 4

1

5

7

8

6

9

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

23

22

Shanghai. I was on the spot with several of my colleagues of the Legation and transported the Minister to the hospital. In spite of his serious wounds, he could not forget the Agreement for the Cessation of Postilities, and immediately dictated and ordered us to telegraph to Foreign Minister YOSHIZA his view of the matter, which was that, owing to his wounds, he would be unable to attend to his daily business for some time, but that he strongly urged the conclusion of the Agreement should not be hindered or delayed because of the bomb incident, which had injured him and others, since the conclusion 12 of the truce agreement was from the viewpoint of 13 national policy of the utmost importance.

"5. I was present at the ceremonial signing of the Agreement for the Cessation of Fostilities in the British Consulate General on May 5, 1932. In the course of the ceremonies the Agreement was taken to the bedsides of Mr. SHIGEMITSU, General UEDA, and the Chinese delegate, Mr. Quo Tai-chi, all of whom were in different hospitals, General UFDA having been injured by the same bomb as I'r. SHIGEMITSU and the 24 Chinese delegate in an assault by students. I'r. 25 SHIGHITSU's leg was amputated an hour or so after he signed."

9

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

MR. FURNESS: I now offer in evidence defense document 2705, a certificate of non-availability of the telegram sent concerning the agreement of cessation of hostilities around Shanghai.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2705 will receive exhibit No. 3541.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3541 and received in evidence.)

MR. FURNESS: It will be unnecessary to read this document.

Prosecution witness J. B. Powell also testified, both on direct examination, transcript page 3252, and on cross-examination, transcript pages 3261 to 3263, regarding the successful efforts of the accused SHIGEMITSU to prevent the expansion and to end the first Shanghai Incident.

I offer in evidence defense document 2905, a certificate of the Editor of the North China Daily News, a British newspaper published in Shanghai at the time of the Incident, certifying copies of dispatches of May 1, 1932 and May 6, 1932, which are contemporary accounts corroborating the statements in the affidavit of MORIYA regarding the sending of messages on the night of grave.

injuries to the accused.

I will read only the last paragraph on page 2, and I will agree that that will be the only part considered in evidence.

ACTING PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I object to the introduction of this document on two grounds. First of all, these are newspaper articles by some correspondent, and up till now newspaper articles have not been considered good evidence at this trial. Then, in this newspaper article of April 30, the author says that it seems to him, and that somebody told him, and so much more so this newspaper article has no probative value whatsoever.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Are you addressing your remarks just to that last paragraph on page 2 -- four lines?

GENERAL VASILIEV: Yes, sir. This is an article of April 30, and in the part you are speaking about, your Honor, there is a statement and it is unknown by whom it is made.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, this objection, I must admit, comes as somewhat of a surprise to me. I submitted this document to the prosecution and was told that if that last paragraph was the only part to be considered in evidence there would be no objection.

S ...

34 1

Many newspaper articles have been introduced by the prosecution, some within the past two days. This is obviously the report of somebody who knew about which he was speaking, and is merely offered as contemporary corroboration of what the witness MORIYA testified to in his affidavit.

ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is overruled. The document will be accepted in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 2905

will receive exhibit No. 3542.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3542 and received in evidence.)

MR. FURNESS: I will read only the paragraph to which I referred:

"Despite his severe injuries it is revealed that Mr. SHIGEMITSU dictated a number of despatches to the government describing the Incident and regretting his own inability to continue negotiations at present, but stressing the importance of concluding the truce agreement as soon as possible.—Reuter."

This Agreement for Cessation of Hostilities

Around Shanghai is exhibit 2419, page 19571 of the transcript. One of the signers was Sir Miles Lampson, then

His Britannic Majesty's Minister in China, now Lord

3 4

5

6

8

9

212

11

12

14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22

23

Killearn, Special Commissioner in Southeast Asia in Singapore, and I tender his statement, defense document 2873, in evidence.

ACTING PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: The prosecution does not object to the admission of this document, with the exception of the last sentence of paragraph 2, beginning with the words, "On the Japanese side" and to the end, as this sentence is a personal conclusion of the witness.

MR. FURNESS: Language Section, will you take defense document 2684 and argument B?

This is evidence of the attitude of this defendant, a relevant fact. There is ample precedent for its admission. In my cross-examination of the prosecution witness SHIDEHARA, the President of the Tribunal, in overruling the prosecution objection to such evidence, stated: "How otherwise could the witness state the accused SHIGEMITSU's attitude? It is a relevant fact." (Record page 1575.)

It is my contention that this is not character evidence. It is the attitude of this accused on a particular occasion, and is obviously relevant to disprove one of the allegations of the prosecution's Indictment.

ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is overruled and the document admitted.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 2873 will receive exhibit No. 3543.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3543 and received in evidence.)

MR. FURNESS (Reading): "I, Right Honourable Baron Killearn, hereby certify that Mr. Mamoru SHIGEMITSU was well known to me when he was Japanese Minister to China.

"In the spring of 1932 when fighting broke out in the suburbs of Shanghai between Japanese and Chinese forces, I, with other neutral colleagues, endeavoured to put a stop to hostilities and to prevent them from spreading and to this end arranged meetings attended by both Japanese and Chinese representatives. On the Japanese side Mr. SHIGEMITSU from the outset cooperated wholeheartedly and much of the credit for reaching an agreement was due to his persistent efforts and patient cooperation.

"When agreement had been signed he was unfortunately seriously wounded in a terrorist outrage.

Despite the fact that he was in severe pain he refused to allow his injuries to hold up the signature of the agreement which was accordingly taken to him in hospital where he signed it.

"(Signed) Killearn."

I now tender in evidence defense document 2684, the affidavit of another of the signers of this Agreement, Nelson Trusler Johnson, then American minister in China, now secretary of the Far Eastern Commission.

I will read only the first sentence of the second paragraph, and the third and fourth paragraphs.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 2684 will receive exhibit No. 3544.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3544 and received in evidence.)

MR. FURNESS: Omitting the formal parts, I read that exhibit:

"I, Nelson Trusler Johnson, being of lawful age and first duly sworn upon oath, depose and say:

"I was United States Minister to China during the period August 6, 1931 to June 10, 1932, when Mamoru SHIGENITSU was Japanese Minister to China and my colleague."

Skipping the next sentence, second paragraph:

"From the time when hostilities between Japan
and China broke out at Shanghai, China in January 1932

.

to the signing of the truce that ended those hostilities on May 5, 1932, Mr. SHIGEMITSU devoted all his time and energy first to finding means of bringing his own countrymen and the Chinese to discussions aimed at ending the strife, and latterly with me, the British Minister, Sir Miles Lampson (now Lord Killearn), M. Wilden, the French Finister, and Count Ciano, the Italian Minister, to bring these discussions to a successful conclusion with the truce agreement of May 5, 1932.

"That agreement had to be taken to the bedside of Mamoru SHIGEMITSU at a hospital, where he lay seriously wounded by an assassin's bomb, thrown onto the speakers' platform where he and other Japanese speakers were standing on April 29th. Throughout this difficult time Mr. SHIGEMITSU spared no effort to localize the incident, and contributed decisively to the creation of an atmosphere of friendliness, making possible a truce and the withdrawal of the considerable Japanese military forces landed around Shanghai."

Greenberg & Barton

ACTING PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

according to the agreement that we had with the defense, the last half of the last paragraph shouldn't have been read as it contains pure characterization of SHIGEMITSU. Therefore, I ask that the last part of the last paragraph, which contains pure character evidence as far as SHIGEMITSU is concerned, be deleted. Evidently, I did not understand Mr. Furness properly. It seems to me that Mr. Furness would adhere to the agreement that we had on that account.

mR. FURNESS: If the Court please, I did not agree to striking out that last sentence of the fourth paragraph. I said that I would argue it as mr. SHIGEMITSU's attitude. I said very definitely what I agreed when I offered the document.

it is enough to glance through the second part of the last paragraph to see that it confirms only character evidence as far as SHIGEMITSU is concerned and is an expression of the personal opinion of the witness. In this paragraph, SHIGEMITSU is characterized as being sympathetic, frank, honest, sincere, and so on. How otherwise can we call this but character evidence?

```
34,498
                       MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, I did
             not read that paragraph to which the General refers.
             Therefore, I think we must be talking about different
            sentences.
                     GENERAL VASILIEV: I am sorry, your Honor,
           I withdraw my objection. I have been advised about
           that.
                   MR. FURNESS: Thank you, General.
                   I tender for identification the book en-
         titled "Sino-Foreign Treaty Series," published in
      10
         1936 by the Commercial Press, a publishing company
     11
     12
        of Shanghai, China.
     13
                 ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted in
    14
       evidence.
    15
                CLERK OF THE COURT: The book entitled
   16
      "Protocol of Borderlines" written in Japanese will
   17
     receive exhibit No. 3545 for identification only,
  18
              ACTING PRESIDENT: Is that printed in Japan-
  19
     ese or Chinese?
  20
             LR. FURNESS: I might correct the Clerk.
 21
    think the book is not entitled the "Protocol." It is
   entitled "Sino-Foreign Treaty Series."
23
24
            CLIPK OF THE COURT: That may be correct,
  but that is the way it was handed to us.
25
                                                                     cn-
           MR. FURNESS: The excerpt which I planned
                                                                    or
                                                                    r
                                                                   ht,
                 maps, if any, a--
            24
                                                                  rity.
                 bearing official seals or other symme-
            25
                 I understand that this request was made but brought
```

8

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

18

19

17

20 21

23 24

22

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, I did not read that paragraph to which the General refers. Therefore, I think we must be talking about different sentences.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I am sorry, your Honor, I withdraw my objection. I have been advised about that.

AR. FURNISS: Thank you, General.

I tender for identification the book entitled "Sino-Foreign Treaty Series," published in 1936 by the Commercial Press, a publishing company of Shanghai, China.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: The book entitled "Protocol of Borderlines" written in Japanese will receive exhibit No. 3545 for identification only,

ACTING PRESIDENT: Is that printed in Japanese or Chinese?

ER, FURNESS: I might correct the Clerk. think the book is not entitled the "Protocol." It is entitled "Sino-Foreign Treaty Series."

CLIPK OF THE COURT: That may be correct, but that is the way it was handed to us.

MR. FURNESS: The excerpt which I planned

3

6

to tender in evidence is entitled what the Clerk called it. It is in Chinese. Might I, then, ask the Clerk to change the title of the exhibit to "Sino-Foreign Treaty Series" in Chinese?

CLERK OF THE COURT: The change will be made in accordance with counsel's request.

(Whereupon, the book "Sino-Foreign Treaty Series" was marked defense exhibit No. 3545 for identification.)

MR. FURNESS: In the course of the Russian phase of the general defense I tendered in evidence the Chinese text of the Hunchun Porder Protocol, 1886, as it appeared in another collection of treaties entitled "Diplomatic Documents During the Ching Dynasty" published in China. The Court then required that the original be tendered or its non-availability be accounted for, transcript page 23,914. The Tribunal then issued an order, Paper 1020, requesting the Supreme Commander to communicate with the Government of China by telegram to request the original or a photostatic copy thereof duly certified, of the Chinese text of this protocol together with map or maps, if any, annexed or attached to said document, bearing official seals or other symbols of authority. I understand that this request was made but brought

2

1

5

4

6

8

9

10

11

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

24

no result. When I was in China, however, I visited the Foreign ministry of China, and I was given a certificate of non-availability, defense document 2706A, which I now tender in evidence.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It may be admitted.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No.

2706A will receive exhibit No. 3545A.

(Whereupon, document 2706A was marked defense exhibit No. 3545A and received in evidence.)

MR. FURNESS: I will read that exhibit:
"The ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic
of China.

"Nanking, September 12, 1947.

"To Whom It may Concern:

made in the archives of the ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Chinese Government for the original Chinese text of Annex I to the Protocol between China and Russia on the Border East of Hunchun, signed at Yench'u, Russia, on June 3, 1886, together with the map or maps, if any, annexed or attached to said document, and bearing the official seals or other symbols of authority of the signers of said Protocol and that the said document and the map or maps are

-

not at present available for production for the purpose of lodging the same with the International Military Tribunal for the Far East nor for making a photostatic copy thereof. The Chinese Government, however, regards the text of the said Protocol as printed on page 348 of Sino-Foreign Treaty Series, published by the Commercial Press, Shanghai, China in February 1936 to be a correct copy of the said Protocol."

I now tender in evidence defense document 2706, the excerpt from that book referred to, the Chinese text of the Protocol, Annex I of the Hunchun Protocol, and the certificate of the translator, defense document 2706B, that the text is identical with the one he had previously translated. The English text should be corrected on line 3, the page number, from 346 to 348.

ACTING PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: Your Honor, I object to the introduction of this document. This document contains the text of the Hunchun Agreement of 1886 with regard to the demarcation of the border in the vicinity of Lake Khasan. We have already introduced the official Russian text of this agreement with the English and Japanese translations of a certain part, exhibit 753. I emphasize that we have already intro-

duced the official text, the photostatic copy of the original, kept and preserved from 1886. There are m: grounds for anybody to question its authenticity. We introduced the full text of the Agreement with the map mentioned therein. The defense wants to refute our text. It could have been done from a legal point of view only be comparing this text with the other official original drawn up in 1886 in the Chinese language. However, the second original is not available. There is a certificate to that effect givon by Vice-Foreign minister of China. The defense is introducing the text which is only regarded as official. This text was published not in an official publication but by some private publishing house in 1936 in Shanghai, and this publishing house certainly could not have the original at their disposal, and it is not revealed from which documents the text included in the volume was taken.

The text of the Hunchun Protocol is only one half of the agreement. The second half is the map of which there is direct mention in the last sentence of the protocol. This map is not being introduced by the defense. Evidently the volume does not contain it. If the Tribunal admits the text of the agreement introduced by the defense, then it would

2

5

7

8

9

11

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

24

create an absolutely inconceivable precedent in the history of international law when an official international agreement is refuted by an unofficial text and when the whole agreement is challenged by introduction of only one half of it. If the defense hasn't got the full official text, that is to say, the authentic original of the protocol in the Chinese language, plus the map, then it follows from that that they have no legal grounds for challenging the other original text which is available and has been presented to this Tribunal. The defense should have reconciled itself with this fact and should not have acted contrary to the generally accepted rules of international law. I submit that this document is inadmissible and should be rejected.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, this is the translation of the Chinese text of the protocol. Both the Russian and Chinese texts are original documents, not translations of each other. Both are entitled to equal dignity. The Chinese text, since manchukuo was at the time of the signing of the protocol definitely Chinese territory, was the basis of the manchukuoan claim that the borderline ran around the west side of Lake Khasan, not over the tops of the hills, including Hill Changkufeng to the

west of Lake Khasan as claimed by the Soviet Union.

Exhibit 753, which quotes only a short excerpt, is the only evidence of this Russian claim. Photostatic copy of the Annex, 2175, is not in evidence. The only part in evidence is the map. So far as the text is concerned, no translation of this complete Russian text and 2175 has ever been furnished, and it is my understanding that documents not translated in English and Japanese are not in evidence.

The Tribunal, by an official order, requested the Republic of China to furnish us with the original text and with maps, if any, attached. The second man in the Foreign ministry of China has certified that neither are available. The Foreign Office of China is the only place where we can go to get such a text, and they say it is not available and that it cannot be furnished to the Tribunal. They say the same thing about the maps, if any are attached. I would produce the original Chinese text if I could. I would produce the original maps if I could. But all my efforts, even supplemented with the order of the Tribunal, have been of no avail.

Article 13C(5) of the Charter provides that the following should be admissible in evidence, and

No.

I quote: A copy of a document or other secondary evidence of the contents of the original if the original is not regularly available." I submit that this is clearly within that provision, and this is the only way I can prove the Japanese contention which the accused SHIGEMITSU was instructed to make in his interview with Ar. Litvinov on 20 July, 1938, exhibit 2633. It is not impugning the Russian text. It is offered to prove another text of equal dignity and the basis of a claim. I submit it should be admitted as the basis on which this accused was instructed to act when he interviewed Litvinov on the 20th of July, 1938.

ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is overruled and the document admitted.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 2706B will receive exhibit No. 3545B, and defense document No. 2706 will receive exhibit No. 3545C.

(whereupon, documents 2706B and 2706 were marked defense exhibits 3545B and 3545C, respectively, and admitted in evidence.)

ACTING PRESIDENT: I want to advise the members of the Tribunal that if they leave their copies of these documents on their desks, they will

2.5

be corrected during the recess. I also want to suggest to counsel, when they make objections, to confine their objections to the point involved and not to make them so expansive. If we argue all objections at this length, we will never finish the case.

You may proceed.

MR. FURNESS: I read commencing on page 2, commencing at the fourth full sentence.

ACTING PRESIDENT: From which document are you reading now?

MR. FURNESS: Exhibit 2706, revised. ACTING PRESIDENT: You mean document.

14 15

1

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

2.5

Whalen & Mors

MR. FURNESS: I am sorry, 3545-C exhibit, if your Honor please.

(Reading) "Proceeding northwestwards from the border-mark Tu, crossing a hill, and reach; ing the north of a sand hill via the west side of Lake Hasang, the border-mark No. 1 is established, the total distance being eight 11 and one hundred sajen. Proceeding thence northwards one 11 and sixty-five sajen, and turning there northwest for four 11 one hundred and thirty-five sajen along sand hills, Ikangtzu is reached, where the border-mark No. 2 is established."

I now tender in evidence defense document 2079, affidavit of Joseph E. Davies who served as American Ambassador to the Soviet Union during a part of the period the accused SHIGEMITSU was ambassador to that country.

I plan to read only portions of this exhibit and agree that only those portions be considered in evidence.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2079 will receive exhibit No. 3546.

(Whereupon, the document above

referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3546 and received in evidence.)

MR. FURNESS: First page commencing second paragraph:

"I, Joseph E. Davies, was the Ambassador of the United States to the Union of Soviet Socialist hepublics from November 16, 1936 to June 9, 1938. During that period I came into contact with Ambassador SHIGEMITSU as a diplomatic colleague, the accredited Ambassador of Japan to the U.S.S.R. I came to know him well.

Skipping the next two sentences.

"In his private conversations with me he spoke of his desire to compose peace in China and to end a war which he personally deplored and which he believed was ill-advised. He also expressed eagerness to prevent that war from spreading into conflict between his country and mine."

Skipping to the next full paragraph.

"On a specific occasion the border incident along the Amur River in June and July of 1937, which had reached a pass where ultimatums had been laid down, I went to see both SHIGEMITSU and Litvinov, informally, 25 to explore the situation, and to urge that the situation be not permitted to develop into war. SHIGEMITSU

20

3

11

12

13

15.

16

18

19

received me immediately."

Skipping the next sentence.

"He assured me that he personally would do what he could to localize the issue and prevent the possibility of war. I believed he was sincere. Shortly thereafter, at a reception given by the Soviet Government, I had opportunity to talk with Foreign Minister Litvinov and ambassador SHIGEMITSU together. At that time it was clear to me that each, while sustaining the positions of their respective governments, was personally trying to avoid the breakdown of negotiations in the interest of peace. The controversy was adjusted. The settlement was unquestionably due to the decisions of the respective foreign offices. It nevertheless afforded me an opportunity to assess the personal attitude of ambassador SHIGEMITSU."

2.5

Passing now to the activities of the accused SHIGHMITSU as Ambassador to the United Kingdom and his efforts to maintain peaceful relations with that country, I tender in evidence defense document 2869, statement of the Right Honorable Lord Hankey, former Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. I have a stipulation with the prosecution that this statement may be admitted in evidence with the following exceptions: paragraph 8, first sentence in paragraph 12, and paragraph 18 from its beginning through sub-paragraph iii, which I shall not read.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Furness, will you please, before you make those announcements, wait until the Members of the Tribunal get their covies so we can mark them? We do not follow them at all.

MR. FURNESS: I am sorry, your Honor. I can't see very well.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Vill you announce those over again so we can mark them?

MR. FURNISS: Paragraph 8. The first sentence of paragraph 12. Paragraph 18 from its beginning through subparagraph 111.

ACTING PRESIDENT: That means all of page 10 is out.

MR. FURNISS. Yes, sir. Has it received an

exhibit number?

2

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted in evidence CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2869 will receive exhibit No. 3547.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3547 and received in evidence.)

MR. FURNESS: Omitting the formal parts, I read that exhibit:

"This statement is directed primarily to such knowledge as I possess of the circumstances in which Mr. SHIGEMITSU, Imperial Japanese Ambassador in London during the early years of the late war, sought at the end of March, 1941, to visit Central Europe in order to meet Mr. MATSUOKA, Foreign Minister of the Japanese Government during his official visit to Germany and Italy.

"2. In order to throw light on the Ambassador's motives in projecting this visit it is necessary to refer to certain conversations in which I took part in the last five months of the previous year. The dates of the talks are extracted from my official engagement book, and other particulars mainly from contemporary notes and correspondence, filled in, where necessary, from memory.

"September - December, 1940.

5

1

- /4

"3. Early in September, 1940, when I was
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, with Cabinet rank,
in Mr. Churchill's Government, I received a verbal
invitation from Major-General F.S.G. Piggott, D.S.O.,
former British Military Attache at Tokyo and an old
friend of the Washinston Naval Conference, 1921-22, to
meet Mr. SHIGEMITSU at lunch. The invitation was
sponsored by another old friend and colleague, the late
Lord Lloyd of Islobran, Secretary of State for the
Colonies, who, as Chairman of the British Council, was
concerned at the deterioration of Anglo-Japanese relations. It was made clear to me from the first that
Viscount Halifax, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs,
approved this contact and that the conversation would
be informal and non-committal.

room at the Savoy Hotel on September 11th, 1940:

present Lord Lloyd, Mr. SHIGEMITSU, Viscount KANO,

General Piggott, Mr. George Sale, and myself. I made

no notes of the afterlunch conversation, but to the

best of my recollection it centered round the deteri
oration in Anglo-Japanese relations, which had started

after the termination of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance

at Washington in 1921-22, and what steps could be taken

to improve them.

2.

The second meeting was on September 25th, 115. again at lunch, in a private room at the Savoy Hotel. The personnel was the same as before, except that Viscount KANO was not present. The conversation was resumed where it had left off on September 11th, namely, on a proposal, either initiated or at least warmly supported by Mr. SHIGEMITSU (who had been working on these lines during the previous summer) that an official British Government Mission, headed by a Minister of Cabinet rank, should proceed to Tokyo, nominally to attend some forthcoming ceremonial anniversary, but also to take the opportunity to make the British case better known, to rally our friends and the British Colony, and to counter the propaganda of the numerous Nazi visitors to Japan. This proposal met with general acceptance and Lord Lloyd undertook to speak to Lord Halifax.

Two days later, on September 27th, the 116. signature of the Tripartite Pact -- Germany, Italy, Japan -- was announced and Japan became a member of the Axis, but not a belligerent. This was a damper on the idea of an official mission.

"7. On November 20th the third and last luncheon meeting took place, this time in a private room at the Ritz Hotel, where Lord Lloyd, Mr. SHIGEMITSU,

25

24

2

3

7

9

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

1 General Piggott and I were the guests of Commander McGrath. The idea of a Government Mission had to be dropped, but Lord Lloyd proposed instead a mission to be sent by the British Council. On his suggestion there was general agreement that I ought to lead the mission, a proposal that was supported enthusiastically by Mr. SHIGHMITSU. I was prepared to undertake the mission if officially asked to do so. Lord Lloyd undertook to report the proposal to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. But relations with Japan were continuing to deteriorate, and the moment was never deemed opportune for the visit."

Skipping to 9 --

ACTING PRESIDENT: This is a good place to stop. We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

20

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23 24

D

1

2

3

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Furness.

MR. FURNESS: Exhibit 3547, resuming at paragraph No. 9:

"1941.

"In February 1941 Lord Lloyd, who had been the leading spirit in the above episode, died and no further meetings of the group took place.

"10. In March I received messages that Mr. SHIGEMITSU would very much appreciate a private and informal conversation with me, and after a talk with Mr. R. A. Butler, Parliamentary Under-Secretary, Foreign Office, who was concerned with Japanese affairs, I consented. During the German night-bombing campaign Mr. SHIGENITSU had a house at Ewhurst, Surrey, where General Piggott lived, and our conversation took place in the General's home. It lasted several hours and was frank and sincere throughout. General Piggott was present most of the time and afterwards made some notes, which I approved two days later, subject to one amendment.

"11. It is unnecessary to describe in detail this long conversation. We went over all the old ground covered by the conversations of 1940, but

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

focused rainly on recont events, especially Japan's adherence to the Axis and Mr. MATSUOKA's impending visit to Berlin and Rome, which had made a deplorable impression on British public opinion. The Ambassador deeply regretted that his country had joined the Axis, but pointed out that the Japanese Government, cold-shouldered by their former allies, who disapproved their policy in China, and from whom they were now almost cut off by exiguous communications, had tended to drift towards the Germans, who cultivated their friendship persistently. He quoted Mr. MATSUOKA's statement that Japan's policy was one of peace, but he did not underrate my contention that Japan, like Italy, might pass from passive to active membership of the Axis, and that Mr. MATSUOKA, in visiting Berlin, would be exposed to the full force of Hitler's demonstrations of German power, his blandishments and threats. This right easily lead to war between Japan and Britain and perhaps to the intervention of the U.S. A. Although the Ambassador remarked that, in that event, Japan could give us a bad tire at first, he was under no illusions as to the ultimate danger to his country.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"12" -- skipping the first sentence. "He agreed that the time had passed for an official British

Mission, which might in his view have produced results in the previous summer, when he had first mooted it. But he thought that it would still be useful to send a few influential British citizens to explain the allied situation to Japan and to emphasize the importance of recent victories in North Africa and the Mediterranean, which was not realized in Japan. In this connection he contrasted the disparity between the continuous human contacts between Germany and Japan with the latter's isolation from Great Britain. He believed that the drift towards Germany was by no means universally popular among the Japanese, and gave some evidence to support it.

"13. The Ambassador hinted at the possibility that Mr. MATSUOKA might be induced to come to London on the return journey but we did not pursue that idea that day. Next day, however, as General Piggott reported at once to me, he told the General that he had decided to urge Prince KONOYE (Prime Minister) by telegram to try and induce Mr. MATSUOKA to return to Japan via London in order to counteract the effects of his visits to Berlin and Rome. He expressed the hope that the British Ambassador in Tokyo might be similarly instructed by the Foreign

Office.

2

"The proposed visit to Central Europe.

"15. On March 28th General Piggott gave me a message that Mr. SHIGEMITSU felt that he must make contact with Mr. MATSUOKA somewhere in Central Europe, preferably at Borne, where they would be free from the influence of Berlin or Rome, and asking for my good offices in obtaining a passage to Lisbon for himself and his military attache.

1916. Inquiry showed that there was tremendous competition for these passages. The matter seemed so urgent and important that on March 31st I appealed direct to the Prime Minister for a priority passage. I supported the appeal by stating that in the conversation on March 22nd the Japanese Ambassador had professed (genuinely I thought) to believe in the certainty of our ultimate victory, but that it was uncertain that his reports were sufficiently read or taken to heart by Mr. MATSUOKA, and that was one reason why he wished to make this contact. After our recent victories in the Mediterranean it would seem especially important to ensure that Mr. MATSUOKA got to know the truth. I suggested that the Ambassador ought to be allowed to take his military attache. The journey to Lisbon

15 16

10

11

12

13

14

17 18

19

21

22

and Borne was a formidable undertaking for a man with a wooden leg. He might find himself amid adverse surroundings in seeing Mr. MATSUOKA, and it was advisable to strengthen him with a kindred spirit with whom he could talk freely and take counsel. "17. The journey, however, did not take 6 7 place for reasons which can best be explained by 8 the following letter from Mr. SHIGEMITSU to myself dated April 2nd: 10 "COPY. "I certify that this is a true copy. 11 "Hankey, 28 December, 1946. 12 13 "Japanese E.bassy "London, W., 2nd April, 1941. 15 "My dear Lord Hankey: 16 "I was so glad to have the opportunity, when you telephoned me, to explain why I had to cancel my 18 proposed trip. On looking into the ways and means of getting to Switzerland, where I would have liked to meet my friend, I unexpectedly found that it took 22 several days to get there from Lisbon. From Lisbon 23 I would have had to go to Barcelona by plane and from 24 Barcelona onwards by train, the latter only running 25 twice a week with all reservations booked up for some time ahead. I did my best to get this information in

.

arrange such a complicated journey at the time at my disposal, in spite of the fact that my friend having abandoned his idea of going to Vichy was kind enough to say he would wait several days for me if I could manage to make the journey. The only alternative was for me to meet him in Berlin but I did not like to do this, and so very reluctantly had to give up the whole idea. It seemed impossible to arrange in spite of all the kindness and trouble taken by my British friends to arrange the necessary facilities. I had hoped to be able to do my bit for our cause, but I assure you that I shall always continue my efforts on the same lines.

"I am most grateful for all the invaluable help you were kind enough to give me in the matter and am only too sorry that I was unable to avail myself of it. This letter is to explain the circumstances which compelled me to cancel the trip and to express my sincere appreciation of your kindness in the matter.

"Yours very sincerely,

"M. SHIGEMITSU.

"The Rt. Hon. Lord Hankey, GCB., GCMG., GCVO."
Skipping the next page:

"(iv) Throughout the whole series of conversation, extending over six months, I cannot find or recollect a word to cast doubt on Mr. SHIGE-MITSU's bona fides, and I believe that my associates would confirm that view."

I will not read the forwarding letter.
ACTING PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: In connection with the document 2869, I invite the attention of the Tribunal to the following exhibits: 1023, 823-A, 773-A, 1275, which are connected with the statement made by Lord Hankey.

MR. FURNESS: I am familiar, if your Honor please, with only one of those exhibits and will reserve my comments for summation, and I should think they could have been reserved in this case for summation.

I next tender in evidence defense document 1772-A, the contemporary record referred to in Lord Hankey's statement, the last exhibit read.

Since this conversation is largely covered in Lord Hankey's statement, I shall read only one paragraph, that is paragraph 3.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1772-A will receive exhibit No. 3548.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3548 and received in evidence.)

MR. FURNESS: The paragraph I plan to read is paragraph 3 on page 5, if your Honor please.

the attitude of doing nothing and awaiting developments, especially as tremendous efforts were being made by our enemies to cause these developments to be unfavorable to us. Surely the policy was to counterattack, and not wait passively on events. He felt that both sides had failed in the past to be active in maintaining friendship, with the result that the friendship had been undermined by evilly-disposed third parties."

2.5

I next offer in evidence defense document

1774, a statement by Lord Sempill, Elected Scots Representative Peer, formerly head of the British Aviation

Mission to Japan. As this contains much extraneous

matter, I intend to read only brief portions. I plan

to read beginning at page 3, the first and second sentences of that first full paragraph, and then skipping

to page 4, the first full paragraph and the next paragraph on pages 4 and 5, up to the last sentence. I

agree further that that is the only part which need be

considered in evidence.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It may be namitted in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1774 will receive exhibit No. 3549.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3549 and received in evidence.)

MR. FURNESS: Commencing with the paragraph referred to on page 3:

"In the summer of 1921 I first had the pleasure of meeting Mons. Mamoru SHIGEMITSU, at an official gathering at which a number from the Foreign Office -- in which he was a senior official -- were present. From that time a long-term friendship sprang up, which was

Carried on spasmodically after my return to Great
Britain towards the end of 1922, until he was appointed
Ambassador to the Court of St. James's, in London, in
1938."

Skipping to the paragraph on page 4 mentioned: "His Excellency's appointment as Ambassador to Great Britain was very timely in view of the fact that Anglo-Japanese relations had declined steadily since I first made his acquaintance in Tokyo in 1921, at the time of the abrogation of the alliance. aggressive tactics of Germany were all too evident at that time, and caused him profound uneasiness, and I well remember him telling me a few months after his arrival in London that unless such tactics were checked in Europe he could see but one outcome -- world conflict. Within about a year, war in Europe had broken out. His Excellency worked with redoubled energy to prevent his own prognostication becoming true, and lost no opportunity of initiating or joining in any discussion that might lead to some solution that would at least localize the conflict that then enveloped Europe.

"He invited me to come and see him at any time that one felt that he might be able to help in preventing the spread of hostilities over the world. When the Foreign Minister in Japan -- Mons. MATSUOKA -- came to

3

5

7

9

12

11

14

13

16 17

18

19

21

Europe in 1941, His Excellency frequently asked me as to how it might be possible for him to get by air to 3 some neutral country to meet his Foreign Minister in 4 order that he might advise him directly against closer 5 cooperation with the Axis. He was in touch with Mr. 6 Winston Churchill -- then Prime Minister of Great Britain -- who had emphasized a number of points that he would like to have put by His Excellency to his Foreign Minister. I remember meeting His Excellency at this time, and his telling me with obvious enthusiasm and elation that he had received most important and effective material from the Prime Minister for this purpose. At this time everything in Europe was disrupted by the war, and this meeting, so full of possibilities, could not take place."

17

15

11

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

The Tribunal will recall exhibit 1062, a message from Prime Minister Winston Churchill to Foreign Minister MATSUOKA of Japan, delivered to the latter on April 12, 1941. It is evident from the note on its face, which note is part of the exhibit, that this was material which Ambassador SHIGEMITSU intended to deliver to MATSUOKA on his trip. It was a set of questions showing the dangers of Japan's siding with the Axis Powers, and Mr. Churchill ended it with the statement:

"From the answers to these questions may spring the avoidence by Japan of a serious catastrophe and a marked improvement in the relations between Japan and Great Britain, the Great Sea Power of the West."

To show that the accused SHIGEMITSU was regarded as a reliable representative to make such delivery, and the reasons for holding him in this regard, the statement of R. A. Butler, a former member of the British Cabinet, then Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, with whom Mr. SHIGEMITSU had many official conversations, some of which are recorded in exhibits before this Tribunal, defense document 2872 is tendered in evidence.

ACTING PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: If your Honor please, I object to the introduction of this document on the

following grounds:

First, the prosecution had no agreement with the defense that that witness would not be called for cross-examination. At present the prosecution do not waive their right of cross-examination. With regard to a number of people, we agreed not to cross-examine them, but in this particular case no agreement of that kind was ever given and will not be given.

My second ground for objection is that in this document we have only a characterization of SHI-GEMITSU, given in a very general way. In order to make my objection brief, I am not going to repeat the statements which are contained in that document. I will only mention that in the following statements SHIGEMITSU is characterized as a man of character and a far-sighted man. Neither of these statements can be verified. It is only an expression of the personal opinion of the author and, therefore, inadmissible.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, I do not wish to use up much time on this objection. If the prosecution wishes to cross-examine this witness, they can apply for it. But certainly the prosecution, which has introduced, I think, 546 affidavits, many from people from afar off, cannot say that any affidavit is not admissible before this Tribunal. The admission of

17

10

11

1

19

20 21

22[°] 23

2

5

6 7

8 9

> 11 12

10

13 14

15 16

> 17 18

> > 20 21

19

22 23

24 25

affidavits is directly provided for in the Charter, and the admission of statements, signed statements, also under the Charter, and I submit that on past precedent the witness does not have to be produced for cross-examination unless the other side makes such application. Obviously the defense itself cannot bring witnesses here whereas the prosecution can.

This objection as to the characterization, it outlines conversations. I do not intend to read anything except the first paragraph, the last sentence in the second paragraph, and the final paragraph. I admit that the other part is character evidence and under the ruling is not admissible.

GENERAL VASILIEV: In this case I withdraw my objection if the characterization is going to be stricken out.

MR. FURNESS: Thank you very much, sir. ACTING PRESIDENT: It may be admitted under those conditions.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2872 will receive exhibit No. 3550.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3550 and received in evidence.)

MR. FURNESS: (Reading) "As Under Secretary

for Foreign Affairs from February '38 to July '41 I had frequent opportunities of exchanging views with Mr. SHIGEMITSU, then Japanese Ambassador in London." Skipping the next three sentences:

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

23

24

"He frequently used language agreeing with 6 me that it would not be in the interests of his country to become involved in a struggle with Great Britain, and he appeared to foresee the peril of war with Great Britain and America in the Pacific.

"I have been shown exhibit No. 1062 which I recognize as having been drafted by Mr. Churchill for the purpose of handing to Mr. SHIGEMITSU whom he regarded as a reliable representative in order that it might be put directly before the Japanese Foreign Secretary during his trip to Europe.

"R. A. Butler, 6/1/47."

To further show the efforts of the accused to maintain friendly relations with Great Britain and the United States, defense document No. 1777, revised, the affidavit of Joseph P. Kennedy, his colleague in London as American Ambassador to Great Britain, is tendered in evidence.

I have agreed with the prosecution as to parts which shall be stricken out. They are quite numerous, and if the Tribunal could follow my reading as I read,

I think it would take far less time than my enumerating them. ACTING P. ESIDENT: It may be admitted. CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1777, revised, will receive exhibit 3551. (Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3551 and received in evidence.) - 17

L effler & Woolf

MR. FURNESS: I agree that the parts not read will not be considered in evidence.

Omitting the formal parts:

"On this day personally appeared before me, an officer duly authorized to administer oaths in the State of Massachusetts, Joseph P. Kennedy, who being by me first duly sworn, deposes and says:

"That during 1939 and 1940 he was Ambassador from the United States of America to the Court of St. James and was in residence at the American embassy in London during this period.

"That during the above-mentioned period, one
Mamoru SHIGEMITSU was the Japanese Ambassador to the
Court of St. James and was likewise in residence in
London during this period. That during this period of
time the affiant had a number of conferences with
Mamoru SHIGEMITSU in his official capacity and also met
him on several occasions at social events; the affiant
on all these occasions discussed general world conditions
with Mamoru SHIGEMITSU and heard him discuss such matters
with others in the affiant's presence. That said Mamoru
SHIGEMITSU in such conversations expressed --" Strike
out the next two words. "-- a desire of avoiding war
between Japan and the Allied Powers and, in fact,
expressed generally opposition to war and favoring a

policy of peace. That said Mamoru SHIGEMITSU in such conversations expressed his intense desire to have his country cooperate with Great Britain and the United States in an effort to avoid war, and he did not favor Japanese collaboration with the Axis Powers. He also expressed a --" Strike out the next word. "-- desire for a peaceful settlement of the China Incident and general desire for peaceful settlements of disputes and against war. The affiant from these many conversations and official and social contacts with Mamoru SHIGEMITSU came to know him well --" Strike out the next lines until the next paragraph.

"Examples of such conversations are as follows:

"On March 3, 1939, Mamoru SHIGEMITSU called on the affient and told him that the Japanese people were very appreciative of President Roosevelt's order to send the body of SAITO, the Japanese Ambassador to Washington, back to Japan on an American cruiser. SHIGEMITSU told the affiant that this action of the President might open the way to solve a lot of Far Eastern problems. He said that he and the then Prime Minister were hopeful that some sort of trade agreement could be worked out with the United States, no matter how small, because it might be the entering wedge which

would help in solving the Chinese problem and restoring peaceful relations once more between the United States and Japan."

Strike out the next paragraph.

"On October 15, 1940, the affiant went to see Mamoru SHIGEMITSU at the Japanese Embassy. He said that he was very much upset about the course his country was taking in tying up with Germany -- "Strike out the remainder of the sentence.

"He said that he had always belonged to the school that believed that their tendency should be to work with the United States, not against them." Strike the next sentence.

"On October 19,1940, the affiant had a conversation with William Hillman, one of the closest friends of the affiant, at that time head of the International News Service in Europe. Hillman told the affiant of a conversation which he had had with Mamoru SHIGEMITSU on the day after the pact was signed. Hillman said that he found the Japanese Ambassador decidedly annoyed and depressed by the conclusion of this pact of which he said he had not been given more than half a day's notice. SHIGEMITUS, Hillman said, told him it was one of the worst blows which he had suffered in his career as it threatened to kill the

Ç.

Japanese reconciliation. SHIGEMITS7 told Hillman that he had been tempted to resign on the first impulse, but then on second thought decided to remain in London as long as it was possible in order to mitigate the effects of the conclusion of the pact and by diplomacy to prevent its being implemented. Hillman said that he told SHIGEMITSU that he felt very doubtful about this and that he was sure that the British Government would find it difficult to see his standpoint. Hillman told SHIGEMITSU that he was of the opinion that this pact had been negotiated under the pressure of the militarists."

To show efforts along lines other than diplomacy, I offer in evidence defense document 1983, the affinivit of H. A. Gwynne for 26 years Editor of the Morning Post, one of the great London newspapers. I do not plan to read the last paragraph.

ACTING PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: The prosecution never gave their agreement that the statement by the editor of the Morning Post should be presented without producing the editor himself for cross-examination. In this particular case, we don't see any reason why the editor of the paper shouldn't have been called here because there are

...

no circumstances justifying his non-appearance here if he could be useful as far as the factual aspect of the matter is concerned.

As far as the characterizations of SHIGEMITSU are concerned they are of no interest to the Tribunal and have no value for the Tribunal.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Furinss.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, I have an argument prepared on witnesses being called for simultaneous translation.

Language Section, defense document 2684.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I want to make my objections as brief as possible, but it seems that my learned colleague is going to make his objections as long as possible, so we are not on an equal footing.

ACTING PRESIDENT: We do not care to hear any more, Mr. Furness, on that argument.

MR. FURNESS: Well, do you care to hear argument on the --

ACTING PRESIDENT: N.o. By a majority the objection is overruled and the document admitted.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1983 will receive exhibit No. 3552.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3552 and received in evidence.)

9 10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

MR. FURNESS: I read exhibit 3552, omitting the formal parts:

"I was Editor of the Morning Post from 1911 to 1937 and my relations with the Japanese Embassy have always been cordial, dating as they do from the first war when Japan was fighting on the side of the allies. The incidents at Tientsin and the invasion of China were the subjects of conversation with Mr. YOSHIDA, recently Premier of Japan, and Mr. SHIGEMITSU, who succeeded him as Ambassador to London. Somewhat to my surprise, both these gentlemen expressed strong opposition to the China Invasion. They clearly expressed disapproval of the venture and equally clearly expressed their strong opposition to the War Party in Japan. Gradually, Mr. SHIGEMITSU gave me his confidence and suggested that I might publish occasional leading articles pointing out that the War Party was losing for Japan friendly feeling which dated from 1914-18 War. He said that from his experience in Moscow and his contacts with Japanese diplomatists in Europe, he was convinced that Hitler at the first serious check sustained by the German Army would be swept away by the General Staff. He then went on to express his fears lest the War Party might lose

2

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

their heads and allow themselves to be infected with the world-domination germ which had already contaminated Germany. He expressed strong opposition to widening the area of hostilities and indicated that he consistently opposed the War Party in Tokyo and was doing all in his power to prevent them from further aggression.

"It is well to bear in mind that these conversations covered a period of two years and I think that I might truly say that he gave me his full confidence as far as it was consistent with his duties as Ambassador. In his talks with me, he indicated that he attached more weight to the leading articles which I occasionally published than I did. He said that he believed they would appeal to the moderate men in Tokyo and enable them to put up a fight against the war mongers. I know that extracts from these articles were cabled to Tokyo and appeared in some of the Japanese press, but I confess that I saw little sign of a favourable reaction. As I have said, Mr. SHIGEMITSU indicated in his conversations with me that he was firmly convinced that Hitler was not going to last. His conversations indicated that he was very well informed about the German attempts to induce Japan to join in the war on her side. To this

5

24

1

2

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

. 3

he expressed consistent opposition and opposition to every suggestion of an extension of the war. In all my conversations, I never once found him wavering from this opinion, nor did I, throughout these conversations extending over a period of two years, recollect any statements which would cause me to doubt his good faith."

I tender for identification the book, "Secret Session Speeches Delivered to the House of Commons, 1940-1943.

"Secret Session Speeches Delivered by the Right
Honorable Winston Churchill," will receive exhibit
No. 3553 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3553 for identification.)

MR. FURNESS: I now tender in evidence -ACTING PRESIDENT: Do you have a defense
document number?

MR. FURNESS: It is a book, if your Honor please, just tendered for identification. I intend to tender a defense document, which is an excerpt from it.

I now tender in evidence defense document

V.

3

19

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

22

,23

24

1795-A, an excerpt from a speech by Prime Minister Churchill, delivered on June 25, 1941, during the darkest days of the war. I intend to only read the portion of this exhibit beginning at the third sentence.

ACTING PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

object to the introduction of this document. It seems to me that in this Tribunal the practice has been adopted of refraining from introducing various speeches by the heads of governments, maybe with the exception of rare cases when such speeches deal with important facts and the attitude of a state.

In this case, an attempt is being made to use Mr. Churchill's address for the purpose of giving character evidence with regard to the accused SHIGEMITSU. What Mr. Churchill said about SHIGEMITSU is of a very general nature, and, in my submission, it is customary to make such statements when speaking of representatives of other nations, and it is the private opinion of Mr. Churchill. These words have no other meaning.

MR. FURNESS: If the Tribunal please, this records a conversation by the Japanese Ambassador, the accused SHIGENITSU, on his leaving London, with

. 21

the head of the British Government. It was not a public statement. It was a statement in a secret session, not published until long after it was delivered.

I submit that the phrases in the second line of the second paragraph are statements of attitude, not statements of character. The first part, beginning with the third sentence, explains only the occasion of the speech, what he was talking about and --

ACTING PRESIDENT: We do not want these long arguments on the admission of exhibits.

By a majority, the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

MR. FURNESS: The accused left London in June, 1941, and arrived in Tokyo in July, 1941. I tender in evidence defense document 2885, the affidavit of Admiral TOYODA, who was then Foreign Minister of Japan. The prosecution has advised me that they do not wish to cross-examine this witness.

ACTING PRESIDENT: The document may be admitted.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2885 will receive exhibit No. 3554.

(Whereupon, the document above

referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3554 and received in evidence.)

MR. FURNESS: I will read that exhibit, omitting the formal parts:

"I, TOYODA, Teijiro, after having been duly sworn according to the Japanese formula, make the following statement of my own free will:

"I am 62 years of age, and reside at No. 473, 1-chome, Shimo-ochiai, Yodobashi Ward, Tokyo, Japan.

KONOYF Cabinet, from July 18, 1941, to October 18, 1941. Soon after my appointment as Foreign Minister, Mr. SHIGFMITSU arrived in Japan, having been recalled from London, where he had been Ambassador. In his report to me which was oral about the European situation, he particularly emphasized the fact that Great Britain would never be defeated in the war with Germany, and he stated his opinion that Japan should in no case be involved in any war, and that the negotiations when under way with the United States should by all means be brought to a successful end."

Pursuant to Court Order Papers 877 and 1311, certain interrogations were put by cable to Sir

Robert Craigie, formerly British Ambassador to

9

20 21

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

22

24

Japan, who is now in London. Sir Robert's answers were returned by cable from Mr. Bevin, Foreign Secretary, and defense document 2877 prepared. Last Saturday, the official document on Foreign Office stationery, duly signed and sworn to by Sir Robert, has been received and is now in the hands of the Clerk of the Court. I wish to tender it in evidence, but with the Court's permission to use as copies the papers now being handed to the members of the Tribunal, which were prepared on the basis of the cable reply. The questions and answers are exactly the same, and this will save time and paper.

ACTING PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev. GENERAL VASILIEV: I do not object to this document in its entirety, but I request of the Tribunal that certain answers should be deleted:

1. The answer to question 4, as containing the personal opinion of the witness, stated in a very general form;

The answer to question 3, because it will have no sense if question 4 is deleted;

3. The answer to question 10, because the witness admits that he does not remember what SHIGEMITSU said and adds that the talk was informal

24

25

12

13

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

The last portion of the answer contains only the witness' personal opinion of SHIGEMITSU;

4. The answers to questions 12, 13, and
14, because the witness states that he does not
remember the matter he was asked about and is giving
his personal opinion of SHIGEMITSU's views, not
stating what he bases his opinion on;

5. The answer to question 15, because it is based only on hearsay;

6. The answer to question 16, because it contains only the opinion of the witness.

MR. FURNISS: If the Court please, first, I'd like to say that I agree with the prosecution that the answers to questions 12, 13, and 14 may be omitted. I agreed with them some time ago. These other objections came to me this morning.

As to question 4, I submit it is not personal opinion. It is information which came to the Ambassador in his official capacity, and it is admissible under any rule of law.

I agree that if question 4 is excluded, question 3 also falls.

As to question 10, I submit that it is the record of Sir Robert's recollection of conversations with Mr. SHIGEMITSU. If any is to be omitted, I

_

agree that the last two sentences of his answer to question 10 may be omitted.

The answer to question No. 15 was based on hearsay, but certainly that is not an objection which is valid before this Tribunal.

As to question 16, it states the reason why the proposed plan did not go through. It is a fact, and not an opinion.

ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is sustained.

MR. FURNESS: Then, the document may be admitted into evidence with the exception of those parts objected to?

ACTING PRESIDENT: Yes.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2877 will receive exhibit No. 3555.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3555 and received in evidence.)

ACTING PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until

one-thirty.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

Knapp & Kapleau

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Furness.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, I will now read the portions of exhibit 3555 which were admitted.

"QUESTION NO. 1: "hat is your name and present office?

"ANSWER: Sir Robert Leslie Craigie,
United Kingdom representative to the United Nations
"ar Crimes Commission.

"OUESTION NO. 2: During what period were you His Britannic Majerty's Ambassador to Japan?

"ANSWER: From eptember 3rd 1937 until the outbreak of war.

"OUESTION NO. 3: Did you, from information received by you in your official capacity as such ambassador, have an opportunity to know the activities and policies of Mamoru SHIGEMITSU, the Ambassador from Japan to the Court of St. James from October 1938 until his return to Tokyo on leave?

ı

"ANSWER: Yes.

3

of war?

5

,

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

24 25 "QUESTION NO. 5: Did Mr. SHIGEMITSU return from London on leave, arriving in Tokyo on or about July 20, 1941, and remain in Tokyo until the outbreak

"ANS YER: Yes.

"QUESTION NO. 6: Did you meet Mr. SHIGEMITSU after his return to Tokyo, and if so, approximately how many meetings did you have with him?

"ANSWER: "es, six or seven times.

"QUESTION No. 7: "Were these meetings of an official or social nature, or both?

"ANSWER: Both.

"QUESTION No. 8: Did he tell you the purpose for which he returned, and if so, what did he say was his purpose?

"ANSWER: Yes, he said he had returned on leave because he believed he could at that moment do more in Tokyo than in London to arrest the deterioration in relations with the "estern Powers.

"OUESTION NO. 9: Did you discuss with him the improvement of Anglo-Japanese relations, the peaceful settlement of differences between the two countries and the avoidance of war, or any of these subjects?

"ANSWER: Yes, we discussed all these subjects.
"OUESTION No. 11: Did you discuss with Mr.
SPIGEMITSU, Admiral TOYODA, the then Foreign Minister,
or other persons, any work Mr. SHIGEMITSU was doing
or conferences he was having with Admiral TOYODA
or other persons on these matters, and if so, what did
Mr. SHIGEMITSU, Admiral TOYODA, or such other persons
say?

"ANSWER: Yes, I can quote two instances.

"(A) At Mr. SHIGEMITSU's suggestion a meeting took place at the Foreign Ministry between Admiral TOYODA, Mr. SHIGEMITSU, and myself at which the critical stage reached in the "ashington negotiations was explained to me and I was asked to urge the British Government to play their part in averting a breakdown.

"(B) At Mr. SHIGEMITSU's request Mr. Voshida SHIGERU came to Hayama about October 1941 to enquire whether I could make any personal suggestions for ending the deadlock in regard to Indo-China. I was, however, precluded by my instructions from taking any official part in discussing the matters under negotiation in Washington."

The rest, I think, was not admitted.

I next tender in evidence defense document 2871, an affidavit by Joseph C. Grew, formerly Ameri-

can Ambassador to Japan, to which is attached an original letter to him, dated 30 December, 1941, from the accused SHIGMMITSU.

I wish to remind the Tribunal that an affidavit was tendered in HIRANUMA's defense and rejected
by the Tribunal because, in so far as it referred to
HIRANUMA, it was solely character evidence. At
that time I expressly reserved the right to submit
it in presenting the defense of the defendant SHIGEMITSU, saying that part of it relating to SHIGEMITSU
dealt with a question of fact, the receipt of a letter
end its contents (transcript page 29,240). The President stated that this had not escaped his attention
and that I might tender it if I sew fit. I have obtained another affidavit dealing only with the letter,
and this is the document tendered.

ACTING PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: If the Court please, I object to the introduction of this document, or rather, to the letter that is attached to the affidavit.

The letter deals with personal relations
between SHIGEMITSU and Mr. Grew and should have remained a matter between them. Fach of them had his own understanding of the purport and aims of the negotiations carried on between the USA and Japan

and of the nature of war, but it in no way helps to find out the actual attitude of SHIGHMITSU. It was not prior to but after the Pearl Harbor attack that SHIGEMITSU wrote this letter.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, certainly the fact that it is a personal letter does not
exclude it. Certainly if SHIGEMITSU in the letter,
personal or otherwise, stated he wanted the war,
favored it, it would be admissible against him.

The letter deplores the coming of war and expresses the wish that it may soon be ended, and is offered in disproof of conspiracy -- of waging a war of conspiracy. I submit that it is clearly admissibl

ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained.

MR. FURNESS: I next offer in evidence defense document 1811, an official dispatch dated 2 September, 1944, from OKAMOTO, Japanese Minister to Sweden, to SHIGFMITSU, then Foreign Minister.

I submit it is relevant to matters which
later took place in French Indo-China while SHIGEMITSU
was still Foreign Minister, since it indicates that
France was at war with Japan. I only offer in evidence the fourth paragraph. The remainder is irrele-

vant.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It may be admitted.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1811
will receive exhibit No. 3556.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit 3556 and received in evidence.)

MR. FURNESS: I read the fourth paragraph of that exhibit:

"4. Radio Paris announced on the 29th"-of August, from the context -- "the names of the members of the French Provisional Government, including
De Gaulle as Prime Minister, Catroux as Minister without Portfolio, and Massigli as Foreign Minister.
They are all Cabinet members of the Algiers Government.
The French Provisional Government made the following
announcement through the radio:

"France has been in a state of war with Japan since Tecember 8, 1941, and is actually fighting with her on the sea. France, in collaboration with the Allies, will keep on fighting with all her might until not only French territories are liberated, but also the enemies of France in Asia and in Europe are repulsed."

To show the efforts of the accused SHIGEMITSU

to meintain peaceful relations with Russia, his efforts to effect a general peace, and to disprove conspiracy to wage war against the Soviet Union, defense document 2051 is offered in evidence. Annex A of this document is a copy of the document received in evidence as exhibit 2745 on identification of the witness Stahmer, transcript page 24,485, and is therefore not included in the copies of this document.

I shall read only portions of this document.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It may be admitted.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2051

will receive exhibit No. 3557.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit 3557 and received in evidence.)

MR. FURNESS: Starting with paragraph 2 on page 2:

"2. Soviet Ouestion.

German peace problem, the Foreign Minister distributed a tentative draft prepared by officials in charge (Annex B), and opened a free discussion on the subject. As the question, however, was of a very serious nature, the necessity of keeping it secret was specifically emphasized. In particular,

the questions to be taken up for the sake of an 2 adjustment of Soviet-Japanese relations, such as the 3 cession of rights and interests in Manchuria, and the 4 cession of Southern Saghalien, and other matters of 5 importance were so complicated and grave that the 6 Conference after all arrived at no conclusion. It 7 was, however, unanimously agreed that any treatment 8 of such questions as routine business should be 9 strictly avoided. Finally, it was agreed that the 10 Foreign Minister be requested to make a basic draft, as the policy on these matters should be decided upon in accordance with the progress of Soviet-Japanese negotiations, hoped shortly to be commenced in Moscow." 13 14 "ANNEX B "DIPLOMATIC MEASURES TO BE TAKEN VIS-A-VIS 15 16 THE SOVIET UNION (DRAFT) (September 12, 1944) General Line. 18 "In view of the present situation, Japan 19 will immediately initiate an active diplomatic demarche 21 towards the Soviet Union, with the object of securing 22 (1) Maintenance of neutrality and improvement of 23 diplomatic relations between Japan and the Soviet 24 Union, (2) Realization, as far as possible, of peace 25 between Germany and the Soviet Union, and further (3) Improvement of Japan's situation, through the

should fall out of the present war. For this purpose, a special envoy shall be dispatched to the Soviet Union to conduct negotiations.

1

"II Outline.

"1. Object of Negotiations.

"To sound out the Soviet Union fully as to her intentions vis-a-vis Japan, to inform her thoroughly of our desire to cooperate, to endeavor to improve Soviet-Japanese relations, and to achieve, as far as possible,

7

the following aims:

8

"(1) The continuation or implementation of the Neutrality Pact. For this purpose, the following agreements shall be concluded, in lieu of the Neutrality

11

10

Pact, or parallel therewith:

12

"A. A confirmation of the obligations imposed by the Neutrality Pact, or an agreement on a prolongation

15

of same.

13

"B. A non-aggression pact.

16

1

"C. A treaty of good neighborliness and friendship.

17 18

"D. An agreement for a peaceful solution of conflicts (abolition of the use of force).

20

19

"E. An agreement for economic cooperation.

21 22

"(2) Use of good offices for peace between Germany and the Soviet Union.

23

"(3) Mediation for peace between Japan and the Chiang regime, if such should prove to be necessary.

24 25

"(4) To sound out the Soviet Union as to her

attitude in case of Germany's collapse or her conclusion of a separate peace, and to endeavor to secure and enhance her favorable attitude towards Japan.

"2. Negotiations to be conducted simultaneous-

"Negotiations shall be conducted between Japan and the Soviet Union on the following matters, simultaneously with the negotiations for the agreements mentioned in the preceding paragraph, irrespective of whether they bear fruit or not. Endeavors should be made to reach, as far as possible, an understanding.

- Japan, Manchukuo, and Inner Mongolia on the one side, and the Soviet Union and Outer Mongolia on the other.
- "(2) Establishment of demilitarized zones along such borders (or, mutual reduction of armaments).
- "(3) Means of solution of conflicts along such borders.
- "(4) Exchange of commodities between Japan-Manchukuo and the Soviet Union.

"Solution shall also be for various other matters pending between Japan and the Soviet Union.

Demands, as to the attitude of the soviet Union towards our initiation of negotiations, especially any counter-

demands that she may possibly present, these cannot be easily foreseen. The following are the demands which are in general anticipated: "(1) Admission of passage across the Tsugaru 3 Ftrait. "(2) Abrogation or revision of the Soviet-Japanese Basic Treatv. "(3) Furrendering of fishery rights. 8 "(4) Cession of the North Manchurian Railway. 9 "(5) Acquiescence in the peaceful activities 10 of the Soviet Union in Manchuria, Inner Mongolia, China, and other parts of Greater East Asia. 12 "(6) Recognition of a sphere of interests for 13 the Foviet Union in Manchuria. 14 "(7) Recognition of a sphere of interest for 15 the Foviet Union in Inner Mongolia. 16 "(8) Abrogation of the Anti-Comintern Pact. 17 "(9) Abrogation of the Tripartite Pact and the 18 19 Tripartite Agreement. "(10) Cession of Southern Saghalien. 20 "(11) Cession of the Northern Kuriles. 21 22 "In this connection, in view of the rapid 24 development of the world situation, and the necessity 25 of dealing with the diplomacy of the Foviet Union, which is active and beyond conjecture, the envoy shall in

advance be accorded wide discretionary authority, so that he may quickly accede to, or refuse, Soviet demands, taking into consideration the situation at the time of the negotiations and the readiness of the Soviet side to comply with our desire. (See Annexed Plan as to the limits of the concession in our minds).

"If soviet demands go beyond the scope mentioned in the plan, the envoy shall as a rule use his discretion, except that he shall ask for instructions from home, should important be on the tapis.

"4. As to Germany, to endeavor to bring her to understand our policy towards the Soviet Union, by explaining the necessity of cooperation between Japan, Germany, and the Soviet Union in the interest of the security of world peace.

"ANNEXED PLAN

"TENTATIVE PLAN ON THE LIPITS OF JAPAN'S CONCESSION TO THE SOVIET UNION IN CONNECTION WITH THE DEMARCHE TO BE MADE TO THE SOVIET UNION.

"1. In case some sort of understanding is reached, through which the Soviet Union maintains her attitude of neutrality, and further contributes to the amelioration of the Soviet-Japanese relations;

"Japan has no objection to acceding to all soviet demands, except to the cession of the North

Manchurian Railway, recognition of the Soviet sphere of interest in Manchuria and Mongolia, abrogation of the Tripartite Pact and the Tripartite Agreement, as well as the cession of Southern Saghalien and the Northern Kuriles.

"2. In case Soviet-German peace is realized;

"No objection to acceding to all Soviet demands,
except the cession of Southern Saghalien and the Northern
Kuriles.

"3. In case peace between Japan and the Chiang regime is realized through mediation by the Soviet Union;

"No objection to acceding to all Soviet demands, except the cession of the Northern Kuriles.

"4. In case Germany should collapse or conclude a separate peace, and general peace should be realized through the good offices of the Soviet Union;

"No objection to acceding to all demands of the Soviet Union.

"5. In case the Foviet attitude towards Japan should deteriorate, and the latter desire to guard against Soviet attack;

"No objection to acceding to all Soviet demands.
That ends that exhibit.

To show the efforts of the accused to end the

-5

17 18

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

22

24

war, I tender in evidence the affidavit of Widar Bagge, presently Swedish Minister to Egypt, and formerly Minister to Japan, defense document 1778, and certificate accounting for the non-production of documents, defense document 2894.

ACTING PRESIDENT: They will be admitted in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1778 will receive exhibit No. 3558.

Defense document 2894 will receive exhibit No.

(Whereupon, the documents above referred to were marked defense exhibits No. 3558 and No. 3558-A, respectively, and received in evidence.)

MR. FURNESS: I read that exhibit:

"I am Widar Bagge, a citizen of the Kingdom of Eweden and presently Swedish Minister to Egypt.

"I was from January, 1937 to September, 1945, Swedish Minister to Japan. In this capacity I had conversations with Japanese nationals regarding peace versations. I had a Japanese friend named Bunshiro SUZUKU treaties. I had a Japanese friend named Bunshiro SUZUKU whom I had known for a long time and in whom I had great confidence. He was not a politician but had excellent connections in the political world and was very well

informed. We sometimes discussed the political situation and one day in the middle of Feptember 1944, he said he had important news. He then outlined a plan to obtain peace and mentioned the concessions that Japan would be prepared to make. He told me that Prince KONOYE was behind this feeler and that he, Mr. SUZUKI, was acting as a go-between. He then outlined the plan to obtain peace and mentioned the concessions that Japan would be prepared to make. The main feature was that all territories conquered during the war would be returned. Even the possibility of giving up Manchukuo might be taken into consideration. Mr. SUZUKI told me that Prince KONOYE and a group of men around him were responsible for this plan which they wanted me to forward to the Ewedish Government with the request that through Swedish channels a feeler should be made in London. It was considered that it might be somewhat easier to find understanding for such a plan in Great Britain than in the United States. Of course, I reported everything to Stockholm.

"During the following months I often met my friend and discussed with him the political situation and the peace problem. I heard from him and from other sources that at this moment the Allied request for unconditional surrender was one of the greatest obstacles

23

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17.

18

19

20

21

22

24

informed. We sometimes discussed the political situation and one day in the middle of Feptember 1944, he said he had important news. He then outlined a plan to obtain peace and mentioned the concessions that Japan would be prepared to make. He told me that Prince KONOYE was behind this feeler and that he, Mr. SUZUKI, was acting as a go-between. He then outlined the plan to obtain peace and mentioned the concessions that Japan would be prepared to make. The main feature was that all territories conquered during the war would be returned. Even the possibility of giving up Manchukuo might be taken into consideration. Mr. SUZUKI told me that Prince KONOYE and a group of men around him were responsible for this plan which they wanted me to forward to the Ewedish Government with the request that through Swedish channels a feeler should be made in London. It was considered that it might be somewhat easier to find understanding for such a plan in Great Britain than in the United States. Of course, I reported everything to Stockholm.

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

6

"During the following months I often met my friend and discussed with him the political situation and the peace problem. I heard from him and from other sources that at this moment the Allied request for unconditional surrender was one of the greatest obstacles

to peace. Even those Japanese who would be inclined to surrender could not think of such a decision as long as they did not know to some extent what the nation might be exposed to. If it was to be feared the Emperor would be treated with insult or that the Japanese na-6 tional pride would be humiliated, then I was told that everybody thought it preferable to continue the war and fight to the bitter end. I had conversations with Mr. Mamoru SHIGEMITSU shortly before he resigned as Foreign Minister of the KOISO Cabinet on April 7, 1945, before I left for Sweden on April 13, 1945. It was known that I was returning to Europe and I was told that it was that fact that decided the Foreign Minister to take up the peace question with me. Mr. SHIGEMITSU sent an old friend of mine, Mr. Tadashi SAKAYA, former Japanese Minister to Helsingfors, to see me. I gathered from my conversation with him that the purpose of sending him was to get a preliminary impression on the peace problem and to probe my sincerity. Few days after my talk with Fr. SAKAYA I was asked to come and see Mr. SHIGENITSU himself. He was in fact very frank. He did not conceal his opinion about the war situation but said that he thought it rather bad. He blamed the military clique and said that now it was for the Japanese diplomats to try to get the country out of the war. He spoke at

19

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20 21

22

23

length about the Emperor as a peace-loving man who had always been against the war. He said that he himself, as well as most of the members of the Japanese diplomatic service, had been against the war from the beginning. He requested me very earnestly to do whatever I could in order to find out the possibilities of obtaining peace for Japan, i.e., a negotiated peace. He asked me to collaborate for this purpose with Pr. Suemasa OKAMOTO, Japanese Minister to Stockholm, who was then to report to Tokyo. From my conversation with Mr. SHIGEMITSU, I retained a vivid memory of his express earnest desire which I believe to have been sincere to do everything in his power to end the war as soon as possible, even at great sacrifice to his country.

"A few days later Mr. SAKAYA again came to see me at the Swedish Legation. He told me that the peace question was very urgent and that Mr. SHIGEMITSU hoped I would leave as soon as possible and go straight to Stockholm to take the matter up with my government.

"The resignation of the KOISO Cabinet a few days later came very unexpectedly, of which Mr. SHIGE-MITSU was Foreign Minister. Mr. Shigenori TOGO accepted the portfolio as Foreign Minister and the next day the same emissary as before called on me to say that Mr. TOGO had been informed of the conversations between

Mr. SHIGEMITSU and myself and that he took the same attitude to the peace question.

"After I arrived in Sweden in May, 1945, while still Minister to Japan, I went to see Mr. OKAMOTO. I asked him whether he had received any confidential telegrams about efforts to negotiate peace and I told him that I had several serious talks with Mr. SHIGEMITSU as Foreign Minister before leaving Japan. I told him that Er. SHIGEMITSU had been very frank and had asked me to make a peace feeler. Mr. OKAMOTO replied that this was a very serious matter but that he had not heard anything about it. I told him that Mr. SHIGEMITSU had resigned just before I left Tokyo, that Mr. TOGO had succeeded him, and I asked Mr. OKAMOTO to make inquiries as to whether or not I should continue my work on this peace effort. Mr. OKAMOTO said that he would send a telegram.

"About two weeks later we met again and he told me that he had just received a telegram from Mr. TOGO, stating that since this had been a matter handled by the former cabinet, it would require some investigation which would take some time before Mr. OKAMOTO would be informed definitely. Both Mr. OKAMOTO and I were very disappointed because of this reply. I remember, however, that at the time when Mr. TOGO took over the portfolio as Foreign Minister it was mentioned in Tokyo as an important point

23 24

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

to his credit that he had a strong position in Moscow since the time he was Japanese Ambassador there. Later on it has also become known that he had preferred to put in his peace efforts in Moscow."

I will not read the rest of it.

Greenberg & Reichers

MR. FURNESS: I assume the certificate of non-availability, No. 2894 -- has that been marked?

Finally, attention is called to Exhibit 6,
"The Instrument of Surrender", dated the 2nd day of
September, 1945, and signed by the defendant SHIGEMITSU
by command of and in behalf of the Emperor of Japan
and the Japanese Government.

That concludes at this time the evidence to be presented in the incivioual phase of the accused SHIGEMITSU.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Is counsel for the accused SHIMADA ready to proceed?

MR. BRANNON: Yes, we are ready.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Brannon.

MR. BRANNON: We move now to the personal defense of the accused, former Admiral Shigetaro SHIMADA:

while in the present century the civilized nations of the world began to place restraints upon the waging of war and, indeed, unanimously committed themselves to the proposition that war was a terrible and unwanted thing, the shouting truth, however, is that they never declared it to be unavoidable. From the days of the hague Convention through the period of the Kellogg-Brianc Pact, all designed to enchain the

progress of potential wars, we are faced with the shocking revelation that beneath the brilliant pleadings of the spokesmen who championed such causes there was one ringing reservation. It was that the respective governments did not see fit to remove the right to war against their fellow nations if national security was threatened. And, moreover, and more revealing still, is the treasured and tightly guarded prerogative that such nations should decide for themselves what facts constitute a threat to their security.

It is for the convenience of the Tribunal, therefore, that we now point out the personal defense of this accused is predicated upon this principle of established international law. Since it can not be denied that governments are composed of mortal man, a government to decide that it is imperiled or threatened by another nation must act through an individual or individuals. These individuals in turn depend upon their own thought processes in order to arrive at a conclusion which will direct their government's line of action. It is this thought process of the individual that becomes all-important for, if the nation itself reserved that right to decide whether war is necessary to protect its security, certainly then the individual, as a component part of that government, also reserves

unto himself that unquestioned privilege.

If, therefore, he surveys the complicated situation before him with sincere and honest appraisal of the issues at hand and arrives at an honest conclusion that his country is jeopardized, threatened and imperiled through the actions of other powers and that war is the only remedy, can he be branded, in the words of the prosecutor, as a murderer, brigand, pirate or plunderer? If the individual is a man of normal intelligence, untainted background and unquestioned loyalty to his country it must appear evident that we are penetrating into a potentially dangerous field of international jurisprudence to rule that the factual background which prompted and motivated his thinking and action is not a complete and adequate personal defense.

Now, therefore, the evidence to be addressed to the Tribunal is designed along this line of thought. It will reveal Admiral SHIMADA as a seafaring naval man who first attained public office on October 18, 1941, after backs world conditions affecting the Far East had all but crystallized. It will not be denied, and is readily admitted, that the accused joined the TOJO Cabinet as Navy Minister and that he later voted for war. It will not be denied that after the

commoncement of hostilities he conscientiously applied nimself toward winning that war. Alleging not only that the Japanese Government itself was justified in the action it took, we now go further toward opening the faucets of understanding that will lead to the individual thinking that prompted this accused to act.

For the purpose of explaining how and why the accused SHIMALA was appointed Navy Minister, we call as our first witness the man who appointed him, former Admiral Koshira OIKAWA.

@ IKAWA

O I K A W A, recalled as a witness KOSHIRO on behalf of the defense, having been previously sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters 3 as follows: ACTING PRESIDENT: You are reminded that you 4 are still on your former oath. MR. BRANNON: Will the witness be handed defense document 2890? (Whereupon, a document was handed 9 to the witness.) 10 DIRECT EXAMINATION 11 BY MR. BRANNON: 12 Q Will you tell the Tribunal whether that is 13 your affidavit and whether or not it is true and 14 15 correct? It is my affidavit, and the contents are true. 16 MR. BRANNON: I offer in evidence defense 17 document 2890, the affidavit of Koshiro OIKAWA. 18 ACTING PRESIDENT: It may be admitted in 19 20 evidence. CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2890 21 22 will receive exhibit No. 3559. 23 (Whereupon, the document above

referred to was marked defense exhibit

No. 3559 and received in evidence.)

MR. BRANNON: I shall read the affidavit:

"May name is Koshiro OIKAWA. I was formerly
an Admiral in the Japanese Navy serving as Navy

minister from September 5, 1940 until October 18,

"When the Third KONOYE Cabinet fell it became my duty to recommend a successor as Navy minister in the new cabinet to be formed. Since I have testified here before relative to the naval attitude during the time I served as Navy minister, I will confine my testimony to the matters affecting the appointment as Navy minister of the accused, former admiral SHIMADA.

Minister before I ever heard that Lieutenant General TOJO was to become the new premier. I had made up my mind that a new man might better function in that capacity than I had and that as a matter of political morality it was best that I not succeed myself. At that time I had heard from Prince KONOYE that there was a strong possibility of Prince HIGASHIKUNI being named the new Prime minister. Therefore, it was not because TOJO became the new premier that I did not succeed myself. I had been a member of two different cabinets, each of which had resigned, and I simply

1941.

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

thought it was time for a new man to take over.

*Up to that time no Navy minister in the history of Japan had ever been appointed except from the ranks of senior officers on the active list. Consequently, the candidates to be considered for the new appointment were necessarily limited. According to my best recollection, the ranking naval officers in order of seniority at that time were as follows: Prince FUSHIMI, Admiral NAGANO, Admiral HYAKUTAKE, Admiral KATO, Takayoshi, Admiral HASEGAWA, myself, Admiral SHIOZAWA, Admiral YOSHIDA, Zengo, Admiral YAMAMOTO, Isoroku and Admiral SHIMADA.

"Of course, Prince FUSHILI, being of royal blood and advanced in years, was not considered at all. Admiral NAGANO was Chief of Naval General Staff. Admiral HYAKUTAKE was on the verge of retirement and was not considered qualified. Admiral KATO had served for the last two years in a nominal assignment as a member of the Supreme War Council and was too long removed from naval affairs to be considered. Admiral HASEGAWA was then Governor General of Formosa, which was an important post. Addiral SHIOZAWA was also to be retired. Admiral YOSHIDA had been my predecessor in the Second KONOYE Cabinet and had been forced to give up his post because of ill health. Admiral YAMAMOTO

17

24

13

18

19

20

21

was then Commander in Chief of the Combined Fleet. Because of his navel ability on the sea he was considered indispensable in that post. Admiral SHIMADA was next in line.

"From the evening of October 16, 1941 until I arose the following morning I carefully deliberated as to whom to recommend as Navy Minister. Around 11 A.m. that morning I went to see Prince FUSHIMI and told him that I considered SHIMADA as my logical successor and he agreed that SHImADA was the best choice of available candidates. My opinion was definitely formulated on the morning of October 17, 1941 and before I knew TOJO was to assur the premiership. Therefore, there is absolutely no truth to the allegation that Admiral SHIMADA was appointed because TOJO wanted him to be. To my knowledge Admiral SHIMADA and TOJO were not even 16 accuainted at that time.

"Admiral SHIMADA came to Tokyo on October 17th and that evening at the Navy minister's official residence I conveyed to him my desire that he accept my recommendation as next Navy Minister. He refused, stating that he had been out of touch with current affairs for some time and felt that there were others better qualified. . 25 He asked me to continue on, but I bold him of my previous decision on that matter. I asked him to

consider the matter over night. The next morning around 8 o'clock Admiral SHIMADA was again summoned to the official residence of the Navy Minister and there both Admiral NAGANO and myself discussed the question of his appointment with him. At that time the Cabinet Formation Headquarters called on the phone, urgently requesting that the new Navy Minister be recommended since all of the other governmental posts except that of Navy Minister had been decided. After renewed insistance by both NAGANO and myself, Admiral SHIMADA agreed to accept my recommendation. "Admiral SHIMADA and I continued our conversations relative to the Navy's views on pending negotiations with America and the need of arriving at a peaceful solution of the difficulties if possible. He fully agreed to my position and we discussed the procedure to be followed in carrying out the Navy viewpoint. He then went to see Premier TOJO for the purpose of stating a prerequisite to his acceptance of the post of Navy

negotiations from a completely new state.

"I mush emphasize the fact that Admiral EHIMADA
was selected simply because he was a high ranking
Admiral in the Japanese Mary, whom I thought possessed

Minister, which was to continue negotiations sincerely

and earnestly and to approach the Japanese United States

3 4

1

5

8

7

10

11 12

13 14

> 15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

34,574

excellent qualifications for the post. The procedure followed in recommending him was no different than that pursued in the past. He and I shared the same views and the decision of the Navy to fight was entirely dependent upon the then existing international situation, which took a violent turn for the worse."

You may examine.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Chief Prosecutor.

SHIMADA

CROSS

34,575

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. KEENAN:

Q Admiral, the choice of Minister of the Navy made in the middle of October of 1941 was of vital importance to the whole Japanese nation, was it not?

- A Generally speaking, that is what I thought.
- Q There had been a failure, during the last KONCYE Cabinet, to obtain harmony between the Army and the Navy as to the policy of Japan, is that not true?

as to most of the policies, I do not -as to most of the national policies, I do not believe
that there were any opinions on which the Army and
Navy disagreed. But on the cuestion of whether to
continue the Japanese-American negotiations, there
were several points on which the Army and Navy were
not in accord.

I should like to continue, that since, at the time, the question of initiating war against the United States had not yet been discussed -- correction:

As that question had not yet been given much consideration, the important problem at that time was the solution of the China Incident, and on that question there was not too much discrepancy between the Army and Navy views.

34,576

What was the difference between the view of the Army and the Navy on that point?

CROSS

A As I said before, the Army and Navy held different views over the question of whether or not it was possible to continue further negotiations between Japan and America.

That is to say, the Army wanted to institute war immediately and the Navy was not willing to join in that decision at that time; is that not correct?

I do not know whether the Army had by that time reached the stage where they desired an immediate commencement of hostilities, but the Navy was firmly convinced that all efforts should be made to continue negotiations with the United States and by peaceful means to solve pending problems between them and thus to avert war.

You were a member of the KONOYE Cabinet from September 5, 1940 until October 18, 1941; is that not correct?

Yes.

And did you not, as Navy Minister, attend the Cabinet meetings?

I did.

And did you not know that General TOJO, as War Minister, was conveying the general view to the

12

3

. 4

5

7

9

10

13

15

14

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

34,577

Army of the subject of immediate war with the Western Powers some time before September, 1941?

I have no such recollection at all. I don't think he did.

Q Well, was TOJO advocating further concessions to the Western Powers in the negotiations?

At first I believed that he showed an earnest desire to continue to have the negotiations continued. But later I began to feel that he entertained doubts as to whether it was possible to continue the Japanese-American negotiations.

About when would you fix the time that TOJO expressed such doubts as you relate?

I don't have an exact recollection as to the date.

AR. BRANNON: I am just a little late on that, Mr. President, but we object to this line of questioning as being far outside the scope of the affidavit.

ACTING PRESIDENT: The objection is overruled.

Do you remember an Imperial Conference that took place in the early part of September, 1941?

Yes, I do.

Is that the 5th of September, 1941, if you

2

1

4

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

> 18 19

20

21

22 23

24

OIKAWA

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

recall, or 6th?

Probably it was some time around that date.

And was there not a decision reached as to the policy of Japan at that Imperial Conference?

I think there was.

Q Did that have to do with the subject matter of war with the United States and Great Britain and the Netherlands

MR. BRANNON: If the Tribunal please, I must again object as being far outside the scope of the affidavit. We are rehashing matters that could have been brought up before. This is the indivioual defense of the accused SHI_ADA. The affidavit confines itself to his appointment alone.

MR, MEENAN: I would like to be heard on that if there is any doubt in the Court's mind as to the propriety of that question.

ACTING PRESIDENT: We would like to hear you.

19

20

21

22 23

24

8 9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

19

18

20

22 23

24 25

MR. KEENAN: If the Court please, this is a key witness. He has to do with one of the most important things relating to aggressive war. From the record in this case it is apparent that there is a very considerable amount of evidence that would lead to the conclusion that the question of war or beace was being debated at this vital period and that the Army took one view and the Navy took another and it was the position of the Navy pro tempore that stopped the war. Leaving aside the invasion of China, there is no more important event in this entire trial in the last eighteen months. Time and again we have heard the expression of the need of resolving or precuring harmony between the frmy and Navy. They are honeyed phrases but the actual fact was of getting someone in the Navy who would be willing to agree to the policy of warfare and warfare practically forthwith.

It is true that this affidavit concerns the subject matter of how the accused SHIMADA happened to be chosen as Navy Minister at this critical period, but I submit that we should not be lulled into quiescence by the bland statement that he was just chosen because he was next in line without carefully examining all of the circumstances. Learned counsel for the accused may have forgotten that within the last few moments he made

a statement from this lectern that this witness selected and chose and named SHIMADA as Navy Minister. We certainly would like to have an opportunity to ask him fully the reason why he made this choice, so critical on a vital point, and that I believe is before this Court for its ultimate determination.

MR. PRANNON: May I be heard just once more?
ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Brannon.

MR. BRANNON: The prosecutor in all of this long oration that he made has not touched the point --

MR. KEENAN: If the Court please, I object to two arguments by one counsel on a single matter in violation of the rules of this Court, and I ask that these rules be enforced.

ACTING PRESIDENT: If the rules are being broken it is because I invited him to speak.

MR. BRANNON: The learned prosecutor has not answered my objection which was that he is outside the scope of the affidavit and that it is improper cross-examination, a rule laid down by this Tribunal. This witness has lived in Tokyo since the conclusion of the war. He could have been called at any time by the prosecution but they seek now, in an individual defense, to go far beyond the scope and purpose of the affidavit and to bring in fill-up matter for other portions of

3 4 5

their case.

"e renew our objection.

ACTIN' PRESIDENT: By a majority the objec-

tion is overruled.

1

3

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

MR. KEENAN: Will you please repeat the question to the witness.

(Whereupon, the question was read by the official court reporter.)

The Navy took the interpretation that the Imperial Conference of 6 September did not make war against these countries as its principal subject, but that, for instance, if the Japanese-American negotiations were not satisfactorily concluded things might develop to such a state as that.

I should like to add that the decision was that if by the middle of October there was no prospect. that the Japanese-American negotiations would be concluded satisfactorily the situation might be such that we might have to go to war -- that we might have to decide to go to war. A decision to go to war is a very grave matter and should not be taken until after many, many conferences had been held. The situation at the time of the Imperial Conference of 6 September was such that no one had the thought of immediate war. We were concerned with the prospect that the situation might develop into such a state where wer would be unavoidable. We did go so far as to use the statement "a decision for war" but in actuality we didn't go that far.

17

18 19

20 21

23 24

Conference that orders were reversed, that was not the comment made by someone et the Wer and net the opening of Tetion for wer, ey should take up the subject of peece first end yor later? Do you recall that being soid? Mr. Bhannon: Agein I object on the ground t is for cutside the scope of the direct exem-ACTING PRESILENT: The same ruling would apply. you recell that remerk being made at the 34,584 tement, wesn't there, and of Staff, Chief of the Neval General quite sure on this point. to, said if there were any doubts matter I think that it was the quite willing to heve the agenda, but since it is a matter of I should not like to commit mark that the agenda was ESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen pasce should be discussed Yar afterwards? There was Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was til 1500, after which the proceedings sumed as follows:) 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

Q The first point on the agenda for the Imperial Conference was the matter of preparation for war, was it not? That is the September 6th conference.

A Preparation for war and not the opening of hostilities, not the commencement of war.

Q Was not the comment made by someone at the Imperial Conference that orders were reversed, that they should take up the subject of peace first and of war later? Do you recall that being said?

MR. BRANNON: Again I object on the ground that it is far cutside the scope of the direct exemination.

ACTING PRESIDENT: The same ruling would apply.

Objection overruled.

Q Do you recall that remark being made at the conference, Admiral?

A I do.

Q Who made it?

Staff, Admiral NAGANO, said if there were any doubts on that point he was quite willing to have the agenda, the order of the agenda changed.

Q Who made the remark that the agenda was in the wrong order, that peace should be discussed first and preparation for war afterwards? There was

3

5

1

2

6

8

9

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22 23

one individual made that statement, wesn't there, and can't you name who it was?

A My memory is not quite sure on this point.

Thinking back over the matter I think that it was the Emperor who said that, but since it is a matter of such grave importance I should not like to commit myself.

ACTING RESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

Duda & Spratt

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
Hilitary Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Chief Prosecutor.

BY MR. KEENAN (Continued):

Q There developed much dissention and even great bitterness between TOJO and KONOYE in early October 1941, did there not?

A I was unable to have my earphones on in time. I could not catch the first part of the question. May I have it repeated?

(Whereupon, the Japanese court reporter read.)

A As far as I know TOJO himself was careful that he would not give in to such emotions,

Q Well, do you recall, Admiral, that that feeling of bitterness was so intense that TOJO refused to speak to the Prime Minister KONOYE?

A No, I do not know that.

Q But you do know that there were strong emotions felt by TOJO that he made a great effort to restrain, is that correct?

A I shall state it in other words. In view of the critical situation it appeared to me that he was careful to prevent any emotional differences or splits within the cabinet. At that time I met with TOJO

ť

12

9

10

11

14

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

continuously, and we felt that there should not only be no differences between TOJO and KONOYE, but that we should be careful to avoid any emotional splits between the army and the navy itself.

Q Well, Admiral, you won't deny knowledge of the fact that there was strong dissention and differences of views between TOJO as War Minister and KONOYE as Prime Minister during these early days in October 1941, will you?

A I am unable to deny it or to confirm it.

Q Well, were they seeing eye to eye on the main crisis that was confronting Japan? Is that what you would have this Court believe?

A I said that there was no emotional opposition between the two, but there were differences of views, of course.

Q And that difference in view, briefly, was that TOJO was in favor of going to war in early October or by the middle of October unless the terms specified by Japan were accepted by the United States and Great Britain and the Netherlands; isn't that true?

A At that time the view was that if the Japanese-American negotiations were not successfully concluded by the middle of October then it would be unavoidable for Japan to start preparations for war.

3

6

7 8

10

11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

It was just to that degree, and I do not believe that -- we had not yet decided to enter a war directly.

THE MONITOR: The latter part should be corrected: At that time the problem of initiating war immediately was not even discussed as a problem yet.

Well, you refer to preparations, Admiral. Did you not have knowledge of the fact that the fleet under Admiral YAMAMOTO had already been preparing by way of practices for the attack on Pearl Harbor?

I don't know about that, but the position of the navy at that time was that the appropriations it had received under the budget were limited solely to such expenses needed for the settlement of the Sino-Japanese conflict, and the navy was given no appropriations other than such sums. There were no items in the budget expressly for the purpose of preparing for a Japanese-American war. No steps were taken for such a war.

And did you learn about the preparations that Admiral YAMAMOTO was making for the attack upon Pearl Harbor, and if so when?

I do not know that.

Did you learn about the preparations for the attack upon Pearl Harbor at any time up to the present?

3

4

2

5 6

8

7

9 10

11 12

13

15

14

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

9

8

10 11

12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

I heard of that after the war, of course, merely a study undertaken at a naval academy, of course. As is true in other nations, our naval college, too, conducted studies, which had been going on for several decades, I believe. That is possible. But the actual plan which led to the war I did not learn of until after the war had begun -- the Japanese-American War had begun.

You do know that the KONOYE Cabinet, the Third KONOYE Cabinet, fell, do you not?

Yes, I do.

Can you state briefly the main reason why KCNOYE's cabinet failed; why he resigned?

At that time I heard from KONCYE his intentions of resigning. I believe this was two or three
theys before the cabinet actually resigned. From what
heard then, he stated that the situation had reached
such a complicated state that he felt that with his small
powers he was unable to solve the crisis, and that in
boking back over the past history of Japan, the only
method of solving such crises was for the Imperial
thouse to take steps directly. He felt, in looking back
over Japan's history of many years, this was the only

KONOYE further stated that at the present

Itime -- at that time -- there was a high officer of

the army, the very able Prince HIGASHIKUNI, that he

Itelt it would be better for such a person to assume

in the through his political experiences, and, further,

that this would be a way of furthering the accomplishment of arriving at a peaceful settlement. He therefore

said that he wished to resign after recommending Prince

HIGASHIKUNI. This was the first time that I had heard

thoughts to me.

Q You were, therefore, surprised that a harmonious cabinet like that of KONOYE's last cabinet would fall by reason of the Premier's resignation; is that correct?

A I am unable to understand the purport of that question quite well. I wonder if I may have it repeated?

Q I will repeat it. As you understood, there was harmony in the KONOYE Cabinet, is that correct?

A From the standpoint of emotions, I do not believe that there were any differences. But with regard to political questions, there were differences of views.

you to state clearly what the differences in views
were. But I will not persist in that effort any longer.
I will go to another subject.

You do say in your affidavit, and I quote:

"As a matter of political morality, it was best that I not succeed myself."

Will you state as briefly as you can what you mean by the words "political morality"?

A To express more concretely the situation at that time, the problem was how to settle the complicated problems which had arisen, and it was felt that

7

8

9

10

12

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

23 24

2

.8

10

11

13

14

15

16

the next cabinet should "wipe the slate clean and start afresh," to use a word which was used at that time.

4 And that is what political morality means?

A No, I had not finished yet. Now, if it became the duty of the new cabinet to wipe the slate clean and to make a new start, I felt that if we members of the cabinet were to remain in the next cabinet it would not be proper for us to remain. It was my belief that it would be going contrary to this policy of making a new start for us old members of the cabinet to stay on in the new, and I felt that as a minister of state, such a view should be my morals.

Q Is it not a fact that you were informed that they didn't intend to leave the slate clean very long?

A I do not understand the question.

Q By that I mean that the question of peace or war with the United States and Great Britain and the Netherlands would be decided in the question of a very few weeks. Didn't you know that?

At that time the expression "wiping the slate clean" did not mean that an early decision for war would be made, but it meant that the decisions of the Imperial conference of 6 September, which set a time limit of the middle of October of taking steps if no prospects of reaching a settlement were reached, that such matters

19

22

21

would be scrapped and that, viewing the international 1 situation anew, a new approach would be made to the problem. At that time no one had any idea of waging a war within the matter of a few weeks simply by the fact of wiping the slate clean.

Well, regardless of wiping the slate clean, was it not determined that if Japan would not obtain its minimum demands, it would have to decide upon the matter of war within a very brief time because of matters of supply, and the like? Isn't that true?

I did not necessarily think so in judging from the situation existing at that time.

12 13

10

11

6

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

Leffler & Wolf

Q Is it a fact that Prince KONOYE told you, in substance, just previous to his resignation in October, 1941, that the Navy should be ashamed of itself for not taking a positive position in stating that it would not support a war with the Western Powers? Do you recall that conversation?

A KONOYE never told me such a thing like that.

Q You were well acquainted with Admiral SHIMADA before you recommended him for the position as Navy Minister?

A In the Japanese Navy there were very few men. -especially among those with the rank of admirals it
was customary, it was a fact, that they all knew each
other very well, were very friendly with each other and
understood each other's character.

Q Well, I am not asking for apologies about it.

I am asking if it was a fact that you knew SHIMADA very well at the time you made the recommendation for him to take this important post in the Cabinet.

A Yes, I did know.

Q Is it not a fact that he had just returned from China on the 15th of September, 1941?

A Yes, that is true.

Q There he had been Commander in Chief of the Chinese Area Fleet?

10

13

15

11

12

17

18 19

20

22

24

,

A Yes, he was in that post.

Q Did not you and Chief of the Naval General Staff NAGANO meet him when he came back from what was alleged to be a career with distinguished military service on the 15th of September, 1941?

A Yes, we did go to meet him.

Q And was he not received on that same day in the morning by the Emperor of Japan?

A Yes, I believe so.

Q And were you not present at that audience, too?

A Yes, I was. I attended with him.

Q And do you recall that he made a detailed report to the Emperor of Japan about the war conditions in one and one-half years of service, such as the Chinese coastal blockade operations and the operations of the Navy Eagles? Do you recall that?

A As a rule reports made to the Throne on such occasions were not given in such details as mentioned.

I don't recollect accurately the exact nature of SHIMADA! s report at the me, but judging from the precedent of other occasions, it is a general rule that a general report on the operations, the conduct of operations is terms of that nature, are reported and the details and not mentioned, such as war episodes and so on.

4

1

6

9

10

11

12 13

15

14

16 17

> 18 19

20 21

22 23

24

A Yes, he was in that post.

Q Did not you and Chief of the Naval General Staff NAGANO meet him when he came back from what was alleged to be a career with distinguished military service on the 15th of September, 1941?

A Yes, we did go to meet him.

Q And was he not received on that same day in the morning by the Emperor of Japan?

A Yes, I believe so.

Q And were you not present at that audience, too?

A Yes, I was. I attended with him.

Q And do you recall that he made a detailed report to the Emperor of Japan about the war conditions in one and one-half years of service, such as the Chinese coastal blockade operations and the operations of the Navy Eagles? Do you recall that?

A As a rule reports made to the Throne on such occasions were not given in such details as mentioned.

I don't recollect accurately the exact nature of SHIMADA's report at that time, but judging from the precedent of similar reports on other occasions, it is a general rule that a general report on the operations, the conduct of operations in matters of that nature, are reported and the details are not mentioned, such as war episodes and so on.

3 4

1

2

6

8

10

11

12

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

23

24

,

Would it refresh your recollection if I recall that he specifically, SHIMADA, referred to the work of the Navy Eagles' bombing of Chungking and the hinterlands of China? Do you recall that?

I have forgotten completely about it and I am unable to recall that.

MR. KEENAN: I ask that the witness be shown the original of IPS document 3288.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

I ask you if you recognise that as the photostat of the Asahi Shimbun newspaper column of its edition of 8 September, 1941?

I believe it is probably so.

I will ask you to examine that part of it that discusses the meeting of SHIMADA and yourself and NAGANO with the Emperor at 10:00 a.m. of September 15, 1941.

Yes, it is written here that we did have an audience with the Throne. I believe it was just as we -- it is written correctly.

MR. KEENAN: We offer that in evidence. ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted. CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3288 will receive exhibit No. 3560.

7 8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

OIKAWA

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3560 and received in evidence.)

Q And that shows, does it not, that a report was made on the bombing of the City of Chungking during the time that SHIMADA was in charge of the Chinese Area Fleet?

A It is true that the bombing of Chungking took place during the time that SHIMADA was Commander in Chief of the Fleet in China waters.

Q And he, of course, in his position would have the responsibility on the spot for such bombings, would he not, for directing them?

(The witness started to speak.)
MR. BRANNON: Just a moment, please.

We object to that as a question for the Tribunal to decide. This man is just a witness and he has been asked his opinion as to whether the accused would be responsible for something.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, I am not attempting to get this witness to decide on whether or not the bombing of a city like Chungking was an act of aggressive war or a crime. I am trying to elicit from this witness, who besides being a witness was Navy Minister, where the responsibilities lie in the chain of command.

*

20

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection

is sustained.

BY MR. KEENAN (Continued):

Q What was the position of SHIMADA while in China at the time the bombing of Chungking took place by the naval fliers, if you know?

I think he was the Commander in Chief of the Fleet in the China area.

As such, in the course of his duties, would he receive reports of bombings by naval fliers of cities -- Chinese cities, including Chunking?

A In the Japanese Navy, problems relating to operations are the responsibility of the Chief of the Naval General Staff. Therefore, I do not believe it would be appropriate for me to testify on such an issue, and, if it could be done, I think it should be -- such testimony should be made by someone connected with the Naval General Staff.

THE INTERPRETER: "Operational problems were not the direct responsibility to be the authority of the Naval General Staff."

Q If that wouldn't come within the chain of command of SHIMADA, can you explain why he would be making a report upon that subject to the Emperor of Japan upon his return from China?

MR. BRANNON: We object to that, Mr.

President, on the ground that it is outside the scope of the affidavit. Not only that, he has penetrated -- the prosecutor -- into the China War again, when this affidavit itself is dedicated only to the fact of the appointment of Admiral SHIMADA by this witness.

This potentially dangerous practice of

allowing the prosecutor to go far beyond the scope of the affidavit to examine on many, many new matters will not only prolong the trial but subjects defense counsel to the feeling that we do not know what witnesses to call in for definite and concise testimony because of the wide range the prosecution may be allowed in cross-examination.

The defense, throughout this trial, has been closely guarded and confined to the scope of the direct examination. We ask only that the prosecution be submitted to that same ruling.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, before compliance with any suggestion for sustaining the objection,

I'd like to be heard very briefly.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Please proceed.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, we believe that the selection of SHIMADA as Naval Minister is one of the key points of this prolonged trial. In the cross-examination of a witness, I dislike to be compelled to state my purpose before I put a question, but in this instance --

The purpose is, Mr. President, to show -to determine whether or not Admiral OIKAWA took
into consideration the type of man, his history,
and his attitude toward aggressive war when he made

the significant, as he claims, very important recommendation for his selection. I want to put that question, and I want to lay the background for it.

I might state, for the benefit of the defense counsel, that that is my last question.

ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is sustained.

MR. KFENAN: We have no further crossexamination of this witness.

MR. LOGAN: I'd like to cross-examine on behalf of KIDO.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. LOGAN:

about this conference in the Imperial presence on September 6, 1941. You stated that you could not recall, but you thought that the Emperor made a few remarks about the order of the agenda.

Now, I want to read to you an extract from the KIDO Diary of September 6, 1941, prosecution exhibit 1135, wherein Marquis KIDO said this: He had a conversation with the Emperor prior to the meeting, wherein Marquis KIDO said to him:

"Then I advised His Majesty that since

T.

1

18

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

21

20

23 24

7

10 11

12 13

14

16

15

17 18

19 20

21

22 23

24 25

HARA, the President of the Privy Council, would ask important questions on His Majesty's behalf, the Emperor should only give a warning in conclusion that the Supreme War Command should exert every effort in order to bring about a diplomatic success inasmuch as the present decision was such an important one that it might lead to a war in which our national fortunes would be staked."

Now, after reading that to you, does that refresh your recollection that HARA, the President of the Privy Council, did ask questions?

I have been able to recall just now, through the passage just read by Counsel Logan. At that time the question of whether or not to continue negotiations, whether this will be brought up first or not, was mentioned by the President of the Privy Council, Mr. HARA.

And, as a matter of fact, Admiral, you were the only one that answered HARA's questions on that at that meeting, is that right?

At that time, I attended the meeting representing NAGANO and the Navy. Because I felt' that I was representing NAGANO and the Navy, I expressed my views in that capacity. It was said afterwards, that NAGANO was silent because he had

different views, but that is not the case. I attended the meeting representing NAGANO and the Navy.

THE MONITOR: "I attended the meeting" should be corrected to "I spoke up."

And, isn't it a fact that the Emperor took the High Command to task for not answering the questions put to him by HARA, and that he ended by reciting the Emperor MEIJI's poem, "Yomo no Umi"?

A Yes, that was so.

MR. BRANNON: Mr. President, I think that is all of the questions to be asked. If I may, I ask that the witness be excused, so that he will not have to return tomorrow.

ACTING PRESIDENT: He may be excused on the usual conditions.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

We will adjourn until tomorrow morning at
nine-thirty.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Friday, 5 December 1947, at 0930.)